SOME PLA[illegible]

LETTER[illegible]

In the DEFENCE of

Infan[illegible]Baptism

And of the

Mode of *Baptizing*,

(Now generally used in the *Church of England*)

By *Sprinkling* or *Pouring* on *Water*.

Which may serve,

For [illegible]FUTATION of a small Treatise

INTITULED,

[*The Reason why not* Infant-Sprinkling, but Believers-Baptism *ought to be Approved*, &c.]

When you bring your Children to be Baptized, let them see that you do most sincerely give them up to God, and devote them to his Service, with firm Resolutions to bring them up in his Fear, if God spare your Lives and theirs; and earnestly pray for his Grace to be given into their Souls.
Christian Monitor, *Pag.* 37.

LONDON, Printed for *R. Wilkin* at the *King's Head* in St. *Paul's Church-yard*. 1698.

Albert Bull Die 1921 10/

TO THE JOINT-PARISHIONERS OF *March*, *Doddington*, *Wimblington*, and *Benwick*.

IT will not, my Brethren, it will not concern you to know the particular occaſion of theſe Letters; *nor am I Licens'd to Publiſh his Name who gave the occaſion; but this I will ſay, That he did very Fairly, and very Ingenuouſly, and as it became a wiſe Man and a good Chriſtian to do: For he did not (as ſome have indiſcreetly and looſely done) liſten with both his Ears to the Objections againſt* Infant-Baptiſm, *and ſo raſhly condemn it without any more a-do: No, but he was very Concernedly deſirous and forward to hear what could be ſaid in the Defence of it too.*

As I remember I have read of that fam'd Conqueror Alexander *the Great, that when a Friend of his was Complain'd of to him, he ſtopt one of his Ears; he lent but one Ear to the Complaint that was made againſt his Friend, and kept the other to hear what his Friend cou'd Reply in Anſwer to it.*

And thus ſhould we conſtantly do in the Caſe of Religion; when ever any Point or Doctrine of our Religion is call'd in Queſtion, we ſhould always reſerve one Ear to hear what may be ſaid in its Vindication and Defence.

And indeed the greateſt, and plaineſt Truths are liable to be ſpoken againſt, and even Jeſuits, Socinians, Antinomians, *and the other Adverſaries of our Faith, will raiſe ſuch Objections againſt the cleareſt Articles of it, as are not to be Anſwer'd by every one amongſt us at the firſt hearing.*

It was a Witty Fiction of Old, that once upon a time Truth came down to this Earth from Heaven; but here among the Sons of Men, being but coldly received, and finding no very welcome entertainment, ſhe e'en took wing and was flying to Heaven again; but in her flight ſhe chanc'd to drop down her Mantle, which Error immediately finding, took up and put on, and has worn it ever ſince. This is the Fable, and the Moral of it is, That no Error does ever appear in the World but 'tis clad in Truth's Mantle, and the diſguiſe is not always ſo thin, or ſo eaſily and readily to be ſeen through, as never to eſcape a diſcovery.

No, But indeed my Brethren, you ought to think more Modeſtly, than to think every Objection unanſwerable which you cannot Anſwer; it is not expected from you, that you ſhould be able to Defend every point of your Religion againſt all Gain-ſayers.

But then, Will you preſently Condemn what you cannot Defend? Or immediately let go a Truth becauſe of an Objection which you cannot Anſwer? Will

any

any one among you part with an Acre of Land upon the same account, Namely because he is not himself able to Defend his Title to it?

And shall we not hold the profession of our Faith as fast as we do a clod of Earth? shall we not take advice and counsel before we be perswaded to quit any part of our Religion, as well as we shall be sure to do before we be perswaded to quit our Interest in the least parcel of an Estate?

But how then will they answer it to God, and to their Consciences, who in the great and weighty Cause of Religion, have taken the Advice only of her Adversaries? And without any further Examination or Tryal, have forthwith condemn'd whatsoever it has pleased these Adversaries to pass their Sentence upon? Was this fair Dealing? Was it to judge righteous Judgment? Or does it look like Sincerity or any real concern for Religion, when the bare accusation of an Enemy has been taken for good proof against her?

My Brethren, I doubt not but our Adversaries have told you that the Baptism which you receiv'd in your Infancy was no Baptism; because Baby-Sprinkling *(as they vainly term it) is no Baptism; but pray be so just to your selves, as to enquire of them whether any Person who has been twice Baptiz'd be not a perfect* Anabaptist? *Nay, be plain, be plain and ask them if you have not Sinn'd by your second Baptism, if it be prov'd that your* Infant-Baptism *was a right Baptism? if they dare to confess the Truth they must tell you that you have, and that you ought to Re-*

pent of that Sin, of that ſecond Baptiſm, if your firſt Baptiſm was rightly adminiſter'd. Well, but then certainly you ought to have been very ſure that your Infant-Baptiſm *was no Baptiſm, before you had run the hazard of* Sinning *by* Anabaptiſm, *or by your being Baptized a ſecond time.*

I have ſome hopes and earneſt deſires that (if you will give theſe following Letters a fair reading) you may Conſider what you have done, and what you ought to have done, and what you ought now to do.

But I forbear, becauſe I would not here be thought to reflect too much upon any Perſon or Perſons among us, no more than I have done in the following Letters. God is my Witneſs, that I bear ill-will to none of their Perſons, whoſe opinions I have here oppos'd; to confeſs the Truth, I have no cauſe: Nay, but I will take this opportunity publickly to acknowledge that I have found very great reſpect and civilities from the moſt and the beſt of them that I know.

Beſides I always endeavour to bear in mind the Apologue of the Sun and the Wind contending for the Travellers Cloak. The Wind made a great bluſter and would have forc'd it from him. But this mad way of contending was ſo notoriouſly in vain, that the ſtronger the Wind blew, it made the Man but hold his Garment the faſter. But then the Sun ſhone forth and Saluted him with a chearful Ray, and warm'd him with a gentle Gleam, and ſo indeed was the Man prevail'd upon to ſuffer his Garment to fall from him. And thus the Sun did, by fair means,

means, what the Wind with all it's Buſtle and Rage could not. The meaning is, That Men will ſooner be perſwaded out of their Miſtakes and Errors by Candidneſs and fair Reſpects, than hector'd out of them with Noiſe and Roughneſs.

I have not, I hope, been Guilty of any ſuch Roughneſs or Clamour, or Bitterneſs, or Evil-ſpeaking in theſe Papers, I have been careful not to give any ſuch offence.

And let me add that I have ſtudi'd to ſpeak plain too; Yea, I will not be aſhamed to confeſs that it is for their plainneſs only that I have been perſwaded to make theſe Letters publick; I have not ſo much as made the Style gawdy with any high-flown Strains. Ornament and Rhetoric was none of my aim, but Sincerely, Faithfully, and to the utmoſt of my mean Abilities to ſhew the naked truth. and whether I have hit or miſs'd my Aim, you may now be pleas'd to examine and Judge. I am

(My very good Friends and Brethren)

From March,
7 *Aug.* 1699.

Your very much obliged,
and moſt humble Servant,

T. Hewerdine.

LETTER I.

SIR,

YOURS of the Third Inſtant has juſt now ſurpriz'd me, wherein at the very firſt daſh of your Pen, you ſomewhat bluntly require, and charge me, as I will anſwer it at the dreadful Day of Judgment, when the Secrets of all Hearts ſhall be diſclos'd, to tell you freely and plainly whether I do in my Conſcience believe, That the way of Baptizing now uſed in the Church of *England*, namely by Sprinkling or Pouring on Water, is a good and juſtifiable way of Baptizing.

Good Sir, You have known me ſome hundreds of times Baptize after this manner, and I wou'd fain hope that I have not by any practice of mine, given you the leaſt juſt Cauſe to ſuſpect me of Hypocriſie. I don't ſay this with any intent to give the Go-by to your Requeſt and Charge, but ſince you have put me to't, I do here ſolemnly proteſt, and wou'd enter the ſame Proteſtation tho' I was immediately to appear before the Judgment-Seat of Chriſt, That I do in my Conſcience believe, that the Mode of Baptizing now uſed in the Church of *England*, by Sprinkling, or Pouring on Water, is

a good and juſtifiable way of Baptizing. And thus far I'm ſure I am in the right, My Conſcience bearing me Witneſs.

But, Sir, You next pretty flatly put it upon me, to inform you how this Mode of baptizing is to be defended and juſtified. Now in good Truth I cou'd be very well contented to ſave my ſelf this Trouble, by referring you to thoſe Books and Pages of Books wherein this Matter is induſtriouſly debated, and the Mode of baptizing (which you now ſeem to call in Queſtion) ſufficiently defended and juſtified, ſo as not to be gainſay'd, but by the ſtiffeſt Obſtinacy. But leſt you ſhould conſtrue this as a giving up the Cauſe, I will here venture to ſay what you ſo earneſtly deſire to hear from me, namely upon what Grounds it is that I my ſelf am perſwaded in my own Conſcience, concerning the Validity and Lawfulneſs of this way of Baptizing.

I will be very brief, and yet go to the Bottom, and riſe by ſuch Steps and Degrees, as ſhall help to carry us over all difficulties, and ſhew us the truth of the Matter in ſome light.

And therefore I begin at our Catechiſm, in which we are well and truly taught, that in the Sacrament of Baptiſm, there's *The outward Sign*, and *The Thing Signified.*

The outward Sign is *Water, wherein the Perſon is Baptized in the Name of the Father*, &c.

And

And Sir, I will not here ſpend either Ink or Paper in the Proof of this, preſuming that we are ſtill agreed thus far. But then,

The Inward part of this Sacrament, or the Thing Signified is the *Holy Spirit*, or the Gifts and Graces of the Holy Spirit, ſuch as theſe mention'd in our Catechiſm, *A Death unto Sin, and a New Birth unto Righteouſneſs*, &c. for you muſt know that whereſoever we read in Scripture of God's giving, or of Man's receiving the Holy Spirit, by the Holy Spirit muſt be meant, The Gifts and Graces of the Holy Spirit, and This I ſay is the Inward part, or Thing Signified by the Water in Baptiſm.

And this was repreſented by the Deſcending of the Holy Ghoſt upon our Saviour at his Baptiſm, *Matth.* 3. 26. and there ſeems to be a plain Evidence of this in thoſe Words of *John* the *Baptiſt*, *I indeed Baptize you with water, but He* (ſpeaking of Chriſt) *ſhall Baptize you with the Holy Ghoſt*. The *Baptiſt*, and (I add) all the Miniſters of Chriſt do but baptize with Water, 'Tis Chriſt himſelf who does the Inward part, and baptizeth with the Spirit, and ſo ſays our Saviour himſelf, *A Man muſt be born of Water and of the Spirit*. For as it is ſaid of Circumciſion, That the *outward Circumciſion of the Fleſh* is as no Circumciſion, without the *Inward Circumciſion of the Heart* too, *Rom.* 2. 28, 29. So to compleat the Sacrament of

Baptiſm there muſt be the Inward part as well as the Outward, For *except a Man be Born of Water and of the Spirit, He cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*, John. 3. 5.

And thus St. *Paul*, in his deſcription of Baptiſm, not only ſpeaks of the external *Waſhing of Regeneration*, but of the Internal *Renewing of the Holy Ghoſt*, *Tit.* 3. 5. And ſo again putting ſome of his *Corinthians* in mind of their being baptiz'd, *Te are Waſhed* and *Sanctified* ſays He; that is, not onely Waſhed with Water, but Sanctified with the Holy Ghoſt. 1. *Cor.* 6. 11.

And to mention but one place more for all, *Be Baptized and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt*, ſays St. *Peter*. *Act.* 2. 33. From whence 'tis very plain, That when the Miniſters of Chriſt baptize with Water, Chriſt himſelf baptizeth with the Holy Ghoſt; which (as I have ſaid before) is the Inward part or Thing Signified by the Water in Baptiſm.

And with great Reaſon therefore do we pray in the Office of baptiſm, *Give, O Lord thy Holy Spirit to this Infant, that He may be Born again; and alſo Waſh him and Sanctifie him with the Holy Ghoſt.* For to clear this Matter to the moſt Vulgar Capacity.

As when we pray in the Communion-Service, *Hear us, moſt merciful Father, we moſt humbly beſeech thee; and grant that we, receiving theſe thy*

thy Creatures of Bread and Wine, may be Partakers of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood. 'Tis as much as to pray that we may not only be Partakers of the outward Part of that Sacrament, the *Bread* and *Wine*, but also that we may be Partakers of the Inward part or thing Signified likewise, which is the *Body and Blood of Christ:* So when we pray for the Baptized, That He may have the Holy Spirit given him, and that he may be Sanctified with the Holy Ghost; 'tis as much as to pray, That he may not only be baptized with the outward part of Baptism, which is *Water*, but also that he may be baptized with the Inward part or thing Signified by Water, which is the *Holy Spirit*.

And hence it is likewise, that as the other Sacrament is sometimes express'd with allusion to the Outward part, when we speak of receiving the Bread and Wine, and sometimes with allusion to the thing Signified, when we speak of receiving the Body and Blood of Christ; so Baptism is sometimes express'd with allusion to its outward part, when we speak of baptizing with Water, and washing with Water, as the Apostle calls it, and sometimes with allusion to the Inward part or thing Signified, when he speaks of baptizing with the Holy Ghost, or baptizing with the Spirit; for so says the A-

poſtle again, *By one Spirit we are all Baptized*, 1 Cor. 12. 13.

I add, That it is no new thing for the Holy Spirit to be figur'd or repreſented by Water, for thus in the Prophet of Old, when God had ſaid, *I will pour Water on him that is Thirſty*, He interprets himſelf immediately, *I will pour my Spirit upon thy Seed*, Iſai. 44. 3. and again, when he had ſaid in *Ezekiel*, *I will Sprinkle Clean Water upon you*, he adds as the meaning of it, *I will put my Spirit within you*, *Ezek.* 36. 25, 27. And again with alluſion to Water is the promiſe of the Spirit expreſs'd by pouring out, *I will pour out my Spirit upon all Fleſh*, Joel 2. 28. and to clear this matter from all doubt, St. *John* quoting theſe Words of our Saviour, *He that Believeth in me, out of his Belly ſhall flow Rivers of Living Water*, *This he ſpake*, ſays that Evangeliſt, *of the Spirit which they that believe in him ſhould receive*, *John* 7. 38, 39. Sir, If you would ſee more and larger proofs of this, you may read Mr. *Mede*'s Diſcourſe upon *Titus* 3. 5.

Indeed I cou'd hardly have thought that there cou'd have been any difference among Catechetical Writers as to this matter, only I find in that ſame diſcourſe of Mr. *Mede*, that ſome would have the Blood of Chriſt to be the thing ſignified by the Water in Baptiſm, as it is by the Wine in the other Sacrament. To which he

he replies, That the Blood of Christ is not once mention'd by the Fathers of the Primitive Church as the inward part of this Sacrament of Baptism, no more than it is in our Liturgy; and he further adds, That the Opinion is Novel, and That the *Lutheran* Divines make it peculiar and proper to the Followers of *Calvin*.

But now, Sir, give me leave to observe to you, That *Calvin* himself seems not to have been always of this Opinion; nay, but he plainly asserts, That the Holy Spirit is the Thing signify'd by the Baptismal Water; For, complaining of the Church of *Rome*, for feigning Confirmation to be a Sacrament, by which the Spirit of Regeneration is conferr'd, he adds, That they transferr'd to Confirmation what was proper to Baptism, meaning that they made the Spirit of Regeneration, which is the Inward part of Baptism, to be the Thing signifi'd by the laying on of hands in Confirmation. *Calv. in Heb.*6.1,2.

And here, Sir, if I was minded to enlarge, I could confirm this Matter with abundance of Testimonies out of the best Writers and Fathers of the Primitive Church; but I forbear, being pretty confident, that there is no great need of their Evidence in so plain a Case.

And now, my good Friend, are not your Eyes open? Don't you clearly see, from what I have said of the Inward part of *Baptism*, how rightly the Outward part may be administred,

by *Sprinkling* or *Pouring on Water?* The Gift of the Holy Spirit, the thing ſignified in *Baptiſm*, is expreſt by *Sprinkling* or *Pouring on*. And is there, or can there be any Reaſon given, why the Thing Signifi'd ſhould be exceeded by the Sign? God himſelf thought it not neceſſary, but makes *Sprinkling*, or *Pouring* on Water ſufficient to repreſent, and ſignifie his giving or pouring on the Spirit; for when He, I ſay, promiſes his Holy Spirit, he does not, no, not ſo much as once in the whole *Bible*, ſay, I will *dip*, or *plunge* into Water, but I will *ſprinkle* or *pour on* Water, *Iſa.* 44. 3. and *Ezek.* 36. 25.

Dr. *Towerſon*, who had once ſaid ſomething which was a little too harſh (as himſelf confeſſes) againſt this way of Baptizing by *Sprinkling*, (whoſe very words our Adverſaries have catch'd hold of, and have boaſted of him, as a brave Man on their ſide) yet when he came to enquire more narrowly into the Matter, he induſtriouſly defends it, and amongſt other Arguments uſes this very Text, *Ezek.* 36. 25. and proves from *Maimonides*, That the Words were ſpoken with reference to the Times of the *Meſſiah*; and affirms, That they cannot be better interpreted than of the *Water of Baptiſm*, applying them (as I have here done) as very well expreſſing the *Outward Sign* of that Sacrament.

And ſhall Men be wiſer than God? Or think it any Wit to mock at and deride his Words?

And

And be at the pains of making a Greek word Engliſh, to make their mockery the plainer; *Sprinkling*, forſooth, out of Sport and Rallery, muſt be call'd *Rantizing*; and *Baptiſm*, when adminiſter'd by *Sprinkling* or *Pouring on Water*, muſt be nicknam'd *Rantiſm*.

But let me tell you, Sir, and you may tell the Author of your little * Book you boaſt of; That when he ſo merrily calls our way of *Baptizing*, *Rantizing*, and our *Baptiſm*, *Rantiſm*; He makes a mock of the very Words of God himſelf; and according to his reproachful way of Speaking, when God promiſes to Sprinkle clean Water upon his People, he muſt not then promiſe to *Baptize*, but only to *Rantize*.

This puts me in mind how I had once the misfortune to hear a wild Wretch call the Lord's Supper. He ſeem'd to quarrel with my Friend for calling that Sacrament the Supper of our Lord; A Supper, ſaid he, A Bite and a Sip, you mean. And he had as much to ſay for the Profane expreſſion, as any one can have, for calling our *Baptiſm*, *Rantiſm*.

Why, Sir, He urg'd that a Supper ought to be a full Meal, that to Signifie our receiving the Body and Blood of Chriſt, we ought to eat a piece of Bread as big as his Body, and to drink as much Wine as he ſhed Blood. And

* A little Book, call'd, *The Reaſon why not Infant-Sprinkling, but Believers Baptiſm ought to be approv'd*, &c.

is

is it not at a like Rate, that ſome plead againſt Baptizing by Sprinkling? You have heard the reaſon why That profane Wretch call'd our way of Receiving the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, a Bite and a Sip; and is it not for a very like reaſon, that our way of Baptizing is by ſome call'd Rantizing?

I will not here ſay with the *Pſalmiſt*, What ſhall be done to the falſe Tongue? but rather with our moſt charitable Lord, Father, forgive them, for ſurely they know not what they ſay or do.

But this 'tis to be ſo Zealous for Externals, when Men think that they can never have enough of the outward Signs of the Sacraments, when yet perhaps the thing Signified, which is the main and principal thing, is as much neglected.

But, Sir, When we receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, if we Spiritually eat his Fleſh, and drink his Blood, which is the inward part of this Sacrament; as to the outward part, it will not matter much how little Bread we eat, or how little Wine we drink. So when any are baptized, if their Souls are purifi'd and cleans'd with the Holy Spirit, which is the Inward part of this Sacrament; as to the outward part, it will not matter much how little Water they are baptized with.

And if you, good Sir, reſiſt not the Holy Spirit

of

of God, nor receive his Grace in vain, but be thereby renew'd in the Spirit of your Mind, and cleanſed from all filthineſs both of Fleſh and Spirit, My Soul for yours if you enter not into the Kingdom of God, tho' you was but ſprinkled with Water, when you was baptized.

Whereas they whoſe hearts are not purified, whoſe Converſations are not cleanſed, who wallow in foul Sins, I muſt and will pronounce them too unclean to enter into the Kingdom of God, tho' they were never ſo much Plung'd, or Dipt into Water never ſo deep, when they were baptized.

But I muſt remember my ſelf that I am not now writing a Book, but only a Letter; and therefore I ſhall only further tell you, that I deſign'd but in this to open the way to a fuller Vindication of the thing in Queſtion. And ſo I conclude at preſent with this promiſe, That you ſhall (God willing) very ſpeedily hear again of this matter from,

Dear Sir,

June 6.
1698. *Your very Humble Servant,*

T. H.

LET-

LETTER II.

SIR,

THO' I concluded my Laſt with a Promiſe to let you hear from me again very ſpeedily, about the Matter in Debate, *viz.* Concerning the Validity and Lawfulneſs of our way of Baptizing by *Sprinkling*, yet I had hardly time to breath, or to take a little Air, before I was alarm'd with your ſecond Letter, wherein you call out to me in great heat and haſte, to let you hear what I have to ſay to ſuch and ſuch Objections.

And, dear Sir, I'll be your humble Servant here again, and attend your Motion; nor ſhall I be much out of my own intended way; for in anſwering the Objections which you ſay ſeem to wound our Cauſe, I doubt not but to blunt, or to turn their Edge ſo as to make them defend it, which is the very thing I aim at. But,

Firſt, You ſay that the very Word (Βαπτιζοντες) *Baptizing*, always ſignifies *Dipping*; yes, and ſo they'll very confidently and peremptorily ſay too, who yet never underſtood one Syllable of Greek in their Lives, and above all the reſt, the Author of the little Book you ſent me

me, is almoſt perpetually ſaying ſo from one end of That book to the other.

But now to this I can give you a very ſhort Anſwer; and ſuch an Anſwer as, I believe, will to you be very ſatisfactory and convincing; For I know you dare depend upon Dr. *Patrick*, now Biſhop of *Ely*, (whoſe Writings you ſo juſtly admire) for the ſignification of a *Greek* Word, and therefore I will obſerve to you what he has noted in the Margin of his moſt excellent Diſcourſe, concerning *Baptiſm*; "Mr. "*Pocock*, (ſays he) hath largely ſhewn, That "(Βαπτίζεσθαι) to be *Baptized*, does not always "ſignifie among the *Jews* the Waſhing of the "whole Body; which is to be obſerved againſt thoſe who now make it neceſſary. I may have occaſion before I have done, to conſult Mr. *Pocock* himſelf, and then you ſhall hear more from him.

And, Sir, if I might be *Sophiſtical*, and play with Particles, as it is the manner of our Adverſaries to do; I might here obſerve of our Pious and Learned Tranſlators, to whom we are obliged for our Engliſh Bibles, that they do not ſeem to underſtand *Dipping* by *Baptizing*; for in our Engliſh Bibles, which they have put into our hands, we uſually read of *Baptizing with Water*.

But now, Good Sir, in all thoſe places where we read of *Baptizing with*, I can hardly think that they would have us there, by *Baptizing* to underſtand

ſtand *Dipping*, becauſe *Dipping with* is not good Sence, to *Dip in*, or *into* Water, is good Sence, but to Dip *with* Water is not. And therefore I ſay I might be perſwaded that it was not the meaning of thoſe Tranſlators, that we ſhould always underſtand *Dipping* by *Baptizing*; or that we may read *Dipping with* Water (which is not good Senſe) where they have Taught us to Read *Baptizing with* Water.

Yea to Baptize with Water, is the common Language of all Engliſh Authors, even of our Adverſaries themſelves; but that they mean to *Dip with* Water when they ſay to *Baptize* with Water, we may no more believe (I ſay) than we may believe *Dipping with* Water to be good Sence. But,

'Tis true we Read that there is but (ἓν Βαπτίσμα) *one Baptiſm*, *Epheſ.* 4. 5. which is an unanſwerable Argument indeed for the only once Adminiſtration of it, directly againſt Anabaptiſm, but then we are alſo told that there are (Διάφοροι Βαπτισμοὶ) *Diverſe Baptizings*, for ſo the Original word ſignifies, tho' tranſlated *Diverſe Waſhings*, *Heb.* 9. 10. which undeniably ſhews that the Ways and Modes of baptizing are various and different; Yea and by the Diverſe Baptizings here mention'd muſt certainly be meant among the reſt, thoſe Sprinklings which we read of *Numb.* 8. 7. and *Chap.* 19. 18, 19.

Again,

Again, 'Tis ſaid of the *Jews*, that when they come from Market, they Eat not except they Waſh, *Mark*, 7. 4. The Original Words are, ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίζωνται, They Eat not except they are *Baptized*; where, by Baptized, we are not neceſſarily to underſtand Dipped, for, as Mr. *Pocock* has abundantly prov'd, *Lavantes à foro totum Corpus non Merſabant.* The *Jews* at their return from the Market, did not always Waſh or Dip the Whole body. *Not. Miſcel. c.* 9. *p.* 390.

And again, *Luke* 11. 38. where we read that the Phariſee wonder'd at *Jeſus* that he did not Waſh before Dinner, the Greek Words are, ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη, That he was not firſt *Baptized.* But now by Baptized in this Text, we cannot poſſibly underſtand Dipped, for there was no ſuch Cuſtom among the *Jews*, as to dip themſelves before their common Meals, no not ſo much as to dip their Hands into Water. For,

Even in the Caſe of waſhing their Hands, *Non Lavant Manus niſi è vaſe (affuſâ aquâ)*; They waſh not their Hands by Dipping them into any Veſſel of Water, but by having Water poured upon them, ſays Mr. *Pocock* from their beſt Authors, *Not. Miſ. c.* 9. *p.* 365. and again *p.* 371. *(Non Lavant Manus)* ſays He, quoting *Maimonides*, &c.) They waſh not their Hands but with Water poured upon them. And tho' ſome of their Authors allow of dipping their Hands into

into Water, yet 'tis only (*urgente neceſſitate*) in Caſes of neceſſity, for to do ſo ordinarily they all forbid them.

And ſo in this Text where it is ſaid that the Phariſee wonder'd at Jeſus, that he was not firſt Baptized before Dinner, ſays Mr. *Pocock*, tho' it be meant according to *Grotius*'s Note, that the Phariſee wonder'd that Jeſus did not firſt waſh his Hands before Dinner, yet he diſagrees with *Grotius* as to the reaſon of the expreſſion, and adds, That if our Lord's Hands had but been Waſhed (*aquâ affuſâ*) by having water poured upon them, there had been no cauſe for the Phariſee's wonder, becauſe the Phariſees themſelves did not otherwiſe waſh their Hands, upon the like occaſion. *Idem*, *p.* 398.

And the ſame Learned Author, after a very Nice and Critical Enquiry, into the various Modes of Waſhing and Baptizing uſed among the *Jews*, he concludes concerning the Word (Βαπτίζειν) to be *Baptized*; namely, That it was very frequently and ordinarily made uſe of to ſignifie, *That Waſhing* which was performed by *Pouring on Water*; *Quod forſan contra illos, qui vim verbi, ubi de Baptiſmi Sacramento diſputatur, moroſius urgent, non inutile erit obſervare*; And this, ſays he, may be obſerv'd with great Advantage againſt thoſe, who when they diſpute of the *Mode* of *Baptizing*, do with too much Stiffneſs and Obſtinacy urge the Word, as if it did

did always signifie to *dip into* Water. *Idem*, *p.* 402.

And again, The Apostle says of the *Israelites* that *came out of Egypt*, that they were all *Baptized in the Cloud, and in the Sea*; but they were not *Dipt* into the *Cloud*, or into the *Sea*, they were only *Sprinkled* or *Dashed* upon with the Waters of the Cloud, and of the Sea, 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. I know 'tis said that this is but a Metaphorical Expression; but still, I hope, that 'tis a pertinent Metaphor, and shews the signification of the Word *Baptizing*, *viz.* That it does not always signifie *Dipping*, which is all that I am Enquiring after at present.

Once more: Were not the Holy Apostles *Baptized* with the Holy Ghost? But how? The Holy Ghost was poured down upon their Heads in *streaks of Fire like unto Cloven Tongues*: The Holy Ghost did not descend like a River of Flame for the Apostles to be *Dipt* into, but was only poured upon their Heads in *streaks of Fire*; and yet 'tis said that they were *Baptized* with the Holy Ghost.

And tho' the Expression in 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. be but Metaphorical, yet I hope that this *Baptism* with the Holy Ghost, is a real *Baptism*, 'tis I am sure the Chief, and Principal *Baptism*, and of which the *Baptism* with *Water* is but the Outward Sign.

And here give me leave to add, That the Primitive *Fathers* call'd *Sprinkling* with Water *Baptizing* with Water, as in the Caſe of *Clinic* Baptiſm, of which you ſhall hear more by and by; here I ſhall only tell you of the *Clinics*, that they were *Baptized* as they lay upon their Beds of Sickneſs; and 'tis well known that they were only *ſprinkled* with Water, and yet were ſaid to be ὂν τῇ κλίνῃ Βαπτιζόμενοι *Baptized upon their Beds.*

And now I hope 'tis pretty plain, as to the ſignification of the word, That *Baptizing* does not always ſignifie *Dipping*; nor conſequently does it exclude all other Modes of *Baptizing*.

But notwithſtanding all this, we, the Miniſters of the Church of *England* it ſeems, amongſt ſome Folks, muſt be great Diſſemblers and Hypocrites: And why I pray? Why? Becauſe when we *Baptize* by *ſprinkling*, we dare not ſpeak as we act, we dare not ſay, *I ſprinkle thee in the Name of the Father*, &c. Alas for us, poor Men! that we are no ſuch daring Blades as ſome others are. But is it ſo indeed? When they *Baptize* by *Dipping*, dare they ſay, *I Dip thee in the Name of the Father*, &c. I am ſure we may with as good Reaſon and Authority ſay, *I ſprinkle thee*, as they ſay, *I dip thee.*

Our Saviour's words are, *Go, teach all Nations, Baptizing them.* Our Adverſaries ask us, Dare you Tranſlate the words, Go, Teach all Nations *Sprink-*

Sprinkling them; and to be even with them, we think it enough to ask them again, Dare you Tranſlate the words, Go, Teach all Nations *Dipping* them? But, Sir, I'll endeavour to ſtrike more light into this matter by a parallel Caſe; Suppoſe then, that our Bleſſed Saviour had ſaid to his Apoſtles, *Go, Hire all Nations into my Vineyard*, paying them ſuch a Sum in my Name: And ſuppoſe further, that ſome of them had paid the Sum in *Silver*, and ſome in *Gold*; Can it be imagin'd that ever theſe different ways of paying the ſame Sum would have proved a matter of Controverſie? Truly according to the aforeſaid way of Contending and Arguing, They who paid in *Silver* might have quarrell'd with the others for paying in *Gold*, and might have diſputed their Quarrel after this manner; Our Saviour has ſaid, *Go, Hire all Nations into my Vineyard, paying them ſuch a Sum in my Name*; but dare you Tranſlate the Words, Paying them ſo much *Gold* in my Name? How then dare you pay in *Gold*, when you dare not Speak as you Act?

Now to this Argument, might not the others have reply'd and diſputed, on the other hand, againſt paying in *Silver*? Our Saviour has Commanded us to Hire all Nations into his *Vineyard*, paying them ſuch a *Sum* in his Name, but dare you Tranſlate the words, *Paying them ſo much Silver*? If not, How dare you pay in *Silver*,

when you dare not Speak as you Act? This Case, I think, sufficiently shews the Folly of our Adversaries, in daring us to use the word *Sprinkling* for *Baptizing*.

Nay, and further, We may suppose, our Saviour giving this Command to his Apostles, to *Hire all Nations into his Vineyard* paying them such a *Sum* in his Name; we may farther suppose him, I say at the same time, to have been in the *Indies*, where Payments for the most part are made all in *Gold:* And Consequently we may suppose that the Apostles hiring these *Indian* Nations into Christ's *Vineyard* did pay them all in *Gold*, according to the General usage of these Countries. Well, but then even upon this supposition, that none of the Apostles had ever paid the aforesaid Sum in *Silver*, but had paid all in *Gold*, yet their practice in this Case would not have made a general Rule, or made it unlawfull to pay the *Sum* in *Silver*; No, but their Successors, and other Ministers of *Christ* (notwithstanding this Apostolical Practice of Paying the *Indians* in Gold) might yet in other places have paid the *Sum* in *Silver*; Yea, and woud have been constrain'd and oblig'd so to do, had they come to hire such Nations into Christ's *Vineyard* where *Silver* is the Current Coyn; and they could not have paid in *Gold* without great and manifold Difficulties and Inconveniencies.

And

And thus, when Christ Commanded his Apostles to *Baptize all Nations in his Name*, he was then in those *Eastern*-Countries, where, by reason of Excessive heat, Washings and Bathings were very frequent, and a Customary practice; and therefore when the Apostles *Baptiz'd* in these hot Nations, tho' we suppose them to have *Baptiz'd* there by *Dipping*, yet their Practice in those hot Countries cannot reasonably be urg'd as generally obliging us to the same way of *Baptizing*, or making it unlawful to *Baptize* any otherwise; no, but their Successors and other Ministers of Christ may yet in other places Baptize by *Sprinkling*, yea, and are even Constrain'd and Oblig'd so to do, when they Baptize in Cold Countries, where they cannot Baptize by *Dipping* without great and manifest dangers and inconveniencies.

In short, as in the aforesaid Case, had our Saviour Commanded such a *Sum* to be paid, it might certainly have been rightly and well paid in *Silver*, notwithstanding the Apostles had paid all the *Indians* in *Gold*; so considering the various significations of the Word *Baptize*, Baptism may well and rightly be Administred by *Sprinkling* or *Pouring* on Water in Cold Countries, tho' it be suppos'd, and, if it may please our Adversaries, even granted, that the Apostles in Hot Nations Baptiz'd all by *Dipping*.

And indeed I must here observe, that our Blessed Saviour, using this Word *Baptizè* in an illimited signification, has thereby discover'd to us not only his great Wisdom, but his great Love and Tenderness to Mankind; for thus he has Accommodated the Ordinance of *Baptism* to all Ages, to all Sexes, to all Dispositions, and to all Climates. And truly the Apostles were to *teach all Nations Baptizing them*, as well the Coldest as the Hottest Countries.

But now shou'd an Apostle have Travell'd into the most *Northern* parts of the World, where the Climate is extreamly Cold, and should have Preach'd the Gospel, and Exhorted them all to take Christ's *Yoke* upon them, and should have told them for their Encouragement That *his Yoke is easie, and his Burden light*; And in Answer to their asking him how That *Yoke* was to be put on, shou'd have reply'd, Why, you must all be *Dipp'd* or *Plung'd* in some Pond or River. Certainly such a piece of hardship, in the extremity of their Cold Regions, cou'd not have been well thought on, nor wou'd they readily have believ'd that *Yoke* to be easie, which was not to be put on without endangering their Limbs, and their Lives with Cold.

And so again, Shou'd a *Turk* upon his Deathbed be converted to Christianity, and earnestly desire *Baptism*, How cou'd it be safely done, if there was no other way of Baptizing but by *Dipping?*

Nay,

Nay, but the aforesaid *Clinic-Baptism*, which we hear so much of in the *Primitive* Writers, was most certainly receiv'd by Asperſion or *Sprinkling*; The *Clinici* were they who receiv'd *Baptism* upon their Sick-beds, and their Baptism by *Sprinkling* is ſufficiently Vindicated by St. *Cyprian*, *Ep. ad Mag.* 76.

I know what ſome are bold to ſay, that God in ſuch Caſes is oblig'd to preſerve us, and to look to't, whatever the danger of *Dipping* may ſeem to be, that no real harm ſhall come on't. But I Anſwer, That I never look'd upon *Baptiſm* as a Charm either againſt Colds or Diſeaſes, nor wou'd I dare to Baptize a very ſick Man by *Dipping* him in a Pond or River, upon this Preſumption, that God will ſave him from all harm by it, by a Miracle: 'Tis not ſafe to truſt to Miracles, or to tempt God out of the ordinary ways of his Preſervation. I Love not harſh Expreſſions, but Mr. *Baxter* ſays, "This "was the Devil's Trick, who wou'd have drawn "*Chriſt* to have caſt himſelf into danger of Death, "by encouraging of him to truſt to a Miraculous "preſervation.

Well, but then, ſay ſome, if a ſtate of Infirmity or a cold Seaſon may make it a little dangerous to Baptize by *Dipping*, may not a more Convenient and leſs dangerous Opportunity be waited for?

And this indeed ſpeaks the general practice of our Adverſaries; you ſeldom hear of a ſick Man Dipt, or of any Dipt by them in the Froſt and Snow time of Winter.

But to ſuch delay of Baptiſm upon any account whatſoever, you may be pleas'd to hear what is ſaid by the aforeſaid Mr. *Baxter*, "'Tis "(he ſays) quite contrary to the conſtant Rule "and Example of Scripture, and ſo he proves "that the 3000 were Baptized without delay, "*Act.* 2. and the people of *Samaria*, *Act.* 8. and "that the *Eunuch* was Baptized in his very Jour-"ney, *Act.* 8. That *Cornelius* and his Friends "were preſently Baptized, *Act.* 11. and that "ſo were they in *Act.* 19. 5. and the *Jaylor*, *Act.* "16. and that ſo were the *Corinthians*, *Act.* 18. *And ſaid Ananias to Paul, why tarrieſt thou? Ariſe and be Baptized*, Act. 22. 16.

But Sir, If Baptiſm was not delay'd upon any account whatſoever; no, not tho' 3000 were Baptized at once, what think you of thoſe who when they have a few Perſons to be Baptized after their way, by *Dipping*, will (one wou'd be tempted to ſay, out of Vain Glory or Oſtentation) make as long work of it as they can, and will hardly Dip above One or Two at a time; that by their more frequent *Dippings* they may make a greater Noiſe and Buſtle in the World.

You

You, Sir, know what I mean, and therefore I will not rub any harder upon this Sore place, but will leave you at preſent to conſider awhile of what I have ſaid to your firſt and great Objection rais'd from the ſignification of the Word (Βαπτίζοντες) *Baptizing*.

You ſhall not be long without an Anſwer to your other Objections from,

Sir,

June 13. 1698. *Your very hearty and humble Servant*,

T. H.

LETTER III.

SIR,

YOUR Firſt and great Objection, againſt the *Mode of Baptizing by Sprinkling*, was Anſwer'd in my laſt; and this comes to aſſure you, that I have not been forgetful of your other Objections, but have thought on 'em again and again; and, conſidering the Men's Principles who have taught you the Objections, I find that

that they'll be Anſwer'd in a Few Words.

For the Objectors you know are upon all occaſions very Loud and Clamorous for plain and poſitive Texts of Scripture, Deductions and Conſequences will by no means down with them; and therefore their Objections will be ſufficiently anſwer'd to them, if I ſhew that the Scripture which they ground them upon, will not maintain them after their own poſitive manner. And, Good Sir, Let it be remember'd, that I do in this Letter argue upon our Adverſaries own Principles and in their own way. For thus,

I need not tell you that their great Objection againſt *Infant-Baptiſm* is this, Where do you read in Scripture that any *Infants* were Baptized, or Commanded to be Baptized? Which Objection, in its due time and place, ſhall have its full Anſwer; but here, Sir, you muſt pardon me if I make uſe of this their own Weapon againſt themſelves, and ask them, Where did you read in Scripture of any that were Baptized by being *Dipt*, or Commanded to be only ſo Baptiz'd, and not otherwiſe?

'Tis true, you once indeed reply'd to this, that whether the Scripture was ſo or no, yet that Antiquity was clear for *Dipping*; and I ſhou'd be glad to hear the ſame kind word drop from the Mouths or Pens of our Learned Adverſaries: I ſhou'd be glad, I mean, to hear them appealing to true Antiquity in any caſe what-

whatſoever, and willing to ſubmit to ſuch good Authority; for then I ſhou'd hope that they wou'd have ſome regard to it in the Caſe of *Infant-Baptiſm*; yes certainly, if they will plead Antiquity for *Dipping*, they muſt allow the Plea to be good when it is made for *Infant-Baptiſm* likewiſe.

And therefore to bring the Controverſie before Antiquity, I wou'd have them to know, that they do not read in Scripture of any that were *Dipt*, or Commanded to be ſo *Baptiz'd*, and not otherwiſe.

"Yes, ſay they, Our Saviour himſelf was *Dip-*
"*ped* when he was *Baptized* of *John* in *Jordan*,
"for the very Original Words (ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ
"Ἰωάννου εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην) may be Tranſla-
"ted, *He was dipped of John into Jordan*, *Mark*
"1. 9.

To this it has been rightly anſwer'd, that the Word ἐβαπτίσθη, does not neceſſarily ſignifie, *He was Dipped*, as I have clearly ſhewn you in my laſt Letter; and then as for the Words, εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην, which our Adverſaries would fain tranſlate *into Jordan*, they have been ſhewn from ſeveral the like Expreſſions in the New Teſtament, That they may as well be tranſlated *at Jordan*; "εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην, may be tranſ-
"lated *at Jordan*, ſays Mr. *Horn*, juſt as εἰς Ἄ-
"ζωτον, is tranſlated *at Azotus*, *Acts* 8. 40. and
"juſt as εἰς πόλιν, is tranſlated *at the City*, *Mat.*
"2. 23.

" 2. 23. and just as εἰς Καφαρναὺμ is translated " at *Capernaum*, *Mat.* 4. 13. and as the like In- " stances may be seen in *Acts* 4. 5. and 20. 16. " and 21. 13. and 25. 15. See Mr. *Horn*'s *Cause* " *of Infants Maintain'd*, p. 70.

But 'tis further Objected, That our Saviour, *when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water*, *Matth.* 3. 16. and *Mark* 1. 10. Sir, I wonder not that these Texts are urg'd by the Common People of our Adversaries, as an Argument to prove our Lord's being *Dipp'd*; but that any Man who has Learning enough to interpret our *English* Bibles, (as they ought to be interpreted) so as to agree with the Original, that any such Learned Man should take an Advantage from the *English* Words, which he must needs know the Original will not bear; This to me indeed is very wondrous.

But who then can sufficiently wonder at the Author of your little Book for his wild Note upon *Matth.* 3. 16. " Our Lord went down so " far and deep into the River, says he, that, " the Text is expres, *when he was baptized, he* " *went up straightway out of the water*: Mark, He " went up *Out* of the Water is the Curious " Penning of the Matter by the Holy Ghost, " to shew the Considerable depth our Lord " went into the Water to be dipt: Thus your Author. But, Sir, I will leave it to others to say, That his wrested Observation belyes the Holy

Holy Ghoſt, I will only tell you, That he ought to have look'd into the Original, before he had preſum'd to make his Remarks upon what the Holy Ghoſt did Pen, for the *Greek* Words were the Curious Penning of the Holy Ghoſt. And I do affirm, That the *Greek* Words in both theſe Texts, *Matt.* 3. 16. and *Mark* 1. 10. only ſignifie, That our Lord went up *From* the Water, as every Man does who goes from the Water-ſide only.

And thus our Saviour's being *in*, or *dipt into* the Water, cannot be prov'd from theſe Texts, by any one who can conſult the Original Words, which in *Matth.* 3. 16. are, Ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, *He went up from the water*; and in *Mark* 1. 10. ἀναβαίνων ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, *Coming up from the water*, which I ſay can never prove him to have been *in*, but only *by* the Water-ſide; for he who goes but from the Water-ſide, goes up *from* the Water, becauſe I think that Rivers do always run in the loweſt Ground.

But, granting that our Bleſſed Lord went into the River to be Baptiz'd, it will not yet follow that he was dipt. For, good Sir, I cannot here but obſerve, both of our Lord, and of the Eunuch (which is your next Objection) and of the many thouſands we read of to have been Baptiz'd, that we never find the leaſt hint of any of their Cloaths being put off. Certainly if they were dipt Naked, as ſome ſay, (which

(which I can hardly believe, becauſe Men and Women were baptiz'd together) or if they put off but ſome of their uppermoſt Garments as others contend, we ſhou'd have heard ſomething of it, for we are told of our Lord's laying aſide his Garment upon a far leſs occaſion, *John* 13.4.

And therefore I ſay that we never hearing one Syllable about their Cloaths, whether any part of them, or all, or none were put off, is a good Argument, *ad hominem*, that they were not dipt.

And now let me appeal to you, Sir, whether we may not give a good Account of this Matter, by ſuppoſing them to have been baptized only by *Sprinkling* or *Pouring on* Water. Why, you very well know, That it was their Cuſtom in thoſe Countries, to go bare up to the Knees, only with Sandals upon their Feet, ſo that they might conveniently enough ſtep into their ſhallow Rivers to be baptized, by having Water ſprinkled or poured upon their Faces, without putting off, or laying aſide any part of their Garments; and therefore, I ſay, conſidering that we never read of any ſuch thing, not one Tittle about putting off or altering their Garments, 'tis as good an Argument againſt their being *dipt*, and as ſtrong for their being *ſprinkled* only, as we can deſire againſt our Adverſaries.

In ſhort, That when they were Baptized, they were ſtript and *dipt* naked, I cannot believe for the aforeſaid Reaſon, becauſe Men and Women were Baptized together; or ſuppoſing that they were Baptized diſtinctly and ſeparately, the Men by themſelves, and the Women by themſelves; yet ſtill they were Men who Baptized; and had this been put upon the Apoſtles to Baptize Women naked, what brave ſport wou'd their Enemies have made of it? To be ſure the Devil with the ſpightful *Jews* and *Gentiles* would have rais'd from ſuch a practiſe as this, a whole Volume of Lewd ſtories, as the Learned know they did from the Celebration of the other Sacrament upon a far leſs Occaſion.

But if the Baptized were *dipped* in their Garments, then what becomes of their Objection which we hear of, from *Heb.* 10. 22. where there is Mention made of our Bodies being waſh'd with pure Water? For how our Bodies can be waſh'd with our Cloaths on, I do not well underſtand. But, Sir, I ſhall here add by the by, that in that Text to the *Hebrews* there is no alluſion to Baptiſm; No, but that it plainly alludes to the *Waſhing* of the *High-Prieſt*, mentioned *Levit.* 16. 4. is even demonſtrated by Mr. *Sydenham* in his Exercitation on *Infant-Baptiſm*, *Cap.* 16.

And for a Concluſion of this whole matter, I will here ſet down ſome of the very Words of that

that Learned Author, "If, ſays he, The Perſon Baptized be not Naked, then this Baptiſm "by *Dipping* is rather a Baptizing Mens Cloaths "and upper Garments than their Bodies; but "if he or ſhe be Naked, how odious a Cuſtom "wou'd this be? I cannot but think that that "part which is Baptized ought to be naked, "that the Water may immediatelv fall upon "that place, or elſe ſomething elſe muſt be "Baptized primarily, and the Fleſh only ſecondarily and by Conſequence.

"And this, ſays he, is the Reaſon why we "only pour Water on the Face, becauſe it is "the moſt Principal part, wherein the Image "of God moſt appears, and the Soul ſhines forth "moſt Eminently; on which all the workings "of Mens humours and affections leave the moſt "viſible impreſſion and ſymptoms; and it's Ob"ſervable that the ſame word in *Greek* (πρόσ"ωπον) ſignifies both the Face and the Perſon, "becauſe the whole Perſon is repreſented by the "Face; and thus we Baptize the Perſon in Bap"tizing his Face, which we can look on and "waſh Naked, and not be aſhamed. So that worthy Author Concludes his 15 Chapter of the abovemention'd Book.

And now, Sir, I come to your Laſt and Grand Argument, with which you make ſo much Noiſe and Cry, and in which you do really Boaſt and Triumph; with what Heat and Bravery

very do you repeat it to be Demonſtration, perfect Demonſtration, that *John* Baptiz'd by *Dipping*, and why, Sir, I pray? Why, ſay you, don't we read that *John was Baptizing in Enon, near Salem, becauſe there was much Water there?* Well, and what then? You add that the *much Water there*, does certainly imply, that all that *John* Baptized in that *Water* were certainly *Dipp'd*; Very good; and before I Anſwer you as to this, I muſt here rejoyce with you a little, that your Stomach ſtill ſerves to ſwallow Conſequences, yea, and very luſty ones too.

But now, Good Sir, This your high and mighty Argument, ſo Confidently and Hotly propos'd, is by no means to be Faintly and Coldly Anſwer'd, but I muſt e'en force my ſelf to put on a little warmth too, and be bold to Challenge all our Learned Adverſaries to contradict me whilſt I ſay that the Original words in that Text Signifie, That *John was Baptizing in Enon near Salem becauſe there were many Waters there.* So that we muſt underſtand the *much Water* in our *Engliſh* Bibles in no other Senſe than as it may be underſtood by the *Many Waters*, (ὕδατα πολλὰ) which are the Original words.

And now you, Sir, who have not always liv'd within the ſmell of your own Chimney, you know that in ſome *Hill-Countries* there are Multitudes of Springs, and we may therefore ſay many Waters, and yet not Water enough

in any one of these *Springs* for a Man to be *Dipt* in.

And the Truth of this business seems to be this, *John* was *The Voice of one crying in the Wilderness*, and he might have been in many parts of the Wilderness; where, had he wanted but a drop of Water, he must have travelled above Ten or Twenty Miles before he cou'd have found it: but he would not continue in any such place because of the Multitudes that daily throng'd to him to be *Baptized* of him; No, but *He stay'd near Salem where there were many Springs or Waters*, because so long as he was thereabouts he had always Water at hand to *Baptize* the People that flockt to him for that End, *For there were* (ὕδατα πολλὰ) *many Waters there.*

And this (I say) may seem to be the True Account of this Passage: and now if you can find any thing in it to prove that *John* Baptized by *Dipping*, pray let me hear it in your next Letter, and you shall then know more of my mind.

In the mean time, having thus given you my Answers to all your Objections which I have as yet heard from you, I shall here take leave to rest awhile, till you may be pleas'd to shape out some more work for,

Sir,

June 19. 1698. *Your obedient and humble Servant,* *T. H.*

LET-

LETTER IV.

SIR,

AT the very first sight of yours, I presently conjectur'd what sort of Task you were setting me; and I am very glad to find that you are grown a little cooler, and that your heat against our Mode of *Baptizing* is somewhat abated; for you say very well, that if we can prove *Infant-Baptism*, the very Weakness and Tenderness of the poor Babes themselves will be some Plea for Mercy, rather than Sacrifice; Nay, and you say that *Infant-Baptism* once prov'd would put an end to the whole Controversie, and there would be no further need of Quarelling about *Dipping* or *Sprinkling*, because you are well assur'd that we will not even in the Case of *Infant-Baptism* refuse to Baptize by *Dipping*, if it be required, and certified that the Child may well endure it.

And therefore you are pleased to say, that you are sorry for your beginning at the wrong end of the Controversie, or rather where there is no occasion for any Controversie at all: And now you ask leave (which Good Sir, you may freely take) to call upon me for my Proofs of *Infant-Baptism*; and for my Answers to your Objecti-

ons, which you have been taught to make againſt it.

Dear Sir, I doubt not but you have Read at leaſt ſome of the many Books which have been Written upon this Subject, by the very Learned Biſhop *Taylor*, Dr. *Hammond*, Dr. *Featly*, Dr. *Towerſon*, The Author of the Caſe of *Infant-Baptiſm*, Mr. *Walker*, Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *Horn*, Mr. *Sydenham*, and others; and I cannot forbear telling you that 'tis an Argument of ſomething which I will not Name, that our Adverſaries Objections ſhou'd be ſo often Printed and Reprinted, as if there had never been one Syllable ſaid in Anſwer to them; whereas I will here venture to ſay unto you, that no one can ſhew you any one Objection in any of our Adverſaries Books againſt *Infant-Baptiſm*, but I will undertake to ſhew you enough to Anſwer it in ſome One or more of the Books which I can produce in the Defence of it.

And you muſt not, Sir, expect any new Diſcoveries in this Caſe from me; all that I can aim at is but to ſpeak plainer than ſome others have done, and this indeed is all that you ſeem to deſire from me; for you want a little light, you ſay, being ſomething in the dark as to this matter, becauſe of the ſilence of the Scriptures, in which you can no where find, either that any *Infants* were Baptiz'd, or Commanded to be Baptiz'd.

Sir,

Sir, In very few words, you have open'd a wide Field of Diſcourſe, and I think that the Caſe of *Infant-Baptiſm* may be pretty throughly Scann'd and Canvas'd by Conſidering your Objection, which I ſhall divide into theſe two Parts.

Firſt, *You find not in Scripture that any Infants were Baptiz'd.*

Secondly, *Neither do you there find that any Infants were Commanded to be Baptiz'd.*

To both which Parts of your Objection I ſhall endeavour to return you a very plain and full Anſwer.

Firſt, You Object and ſay, *That you find not in Scripture that any Infants were Baptized.*

And here you take occaſion to tell me what a Triumphant noiſe the *Forty* Texts in your lit-Book have made; 'Tis the Common Boaſt among ſome Folk, you ſay, that there is not *One* Text in Scripture to Countenance *Infant-Baptiſm*, but *Forty* that are Point-Blank againſt it; I ſuppoſe they mean if the Author of your little Book ſpeaks the Truth in this Matter.

But whether he has done ſo or no, I ſhall have occaſion before I have done, ſtill farther to Conſider: For as faſt as any of his *Forty* Texts come in my way, I ſhall not be afraid to enquire into the meaning of them.

Nay, but the greateſt Strength of that Book is ſpent againſt our Mode of Baptizing by *Sprinkling*,

ling. Your *Author* has a Throw at this where-ever he meets with the Word *Baptize*, and takes it for granted all along, That *to Baptize* ſignifies always *to Dip*, which I think has been ſufficiently diſprov'd; and therefore if all that he has ſaid and repeated again and again to this purpoſe in his little Book was taken out, his *Forty* Texts wou'd dwindle into a far leſs number, and there wou'd not be many of them left ſtanding againſt *Infant-Baptiſm.*

Well, but in Anſwer to the firſt part of your Objection, *That you no where find in Scripture, that any Infants were Baptized.*

Firſt, I'll make an Impartial Enquiry, what I can find in Scripture to have been done in this Caſe of Baptizing by Chriſt, and by his Diſciples in his Life-time. And,

Secondly, What I can find to have been done by his Apoſtles after his Aſcenſion into Heaven.

I. We have no very large account in the *New Teſtament* of Chriſt's or of his Diſciples *Baptizing* in his Life-time; not one word more than what you may ſee in theſe few Texts, *John* 3. 22, 26. *John* 4. 1. 2.

The Firſt of which Texts ſays, that *Jeſus Baptized*, but ſays not whom; not a Syllable to exclude Infants, *John* 3. 22.

The

The Second Text ſays, that *Jeſus Baptized, and all Men came to him.* John 3. 26. But here, Sir, that our *Engliſh* Tranſlation may not lead you into a miſtake, I muſt inform you, that there is no particular word in the Original that ſignifies *Men* only; but the *Greek* word is πάντες, *Jeſus Baptized, and* (πάντες) *all came to him:* All without Exception.

And here I will do ſo much Right to the *Author* of your little Book, as to ſuppoſe he had obſerv'd this to be the ſenſe of the Original words in this Text, and therefore he paſſes it over, as rather making for than againſt *Infant-Baptiſm*; He does not, I ſay, mention this amongſt the *Forty* Texts in his Book, becauſe he knew the *Greek* Word here Tranſlated *All Men* ſignifies as well *All Children*, even all without Exception, All of all Ages.

I proceed therefore to the *Third* and *Laſt* Text, which ſays, *That Jeſus made and Baptized more Diſciples than John, (tho' Jeſus himſelf Baptized not, but his Diſciples) John* 4. 1, 2. And here the Author of your little Book wou'd fain gather from the word *Diſciples*, that no Children were Baptiz'd, but all that he ſay's is grounded upon a Groſs Miſtake, which ſuppoſes them to have been *Diſciples* before Baptiſm, whereas the Text ſays plainly, That *they were made and Baptized Diſciples:* That is, they were by *Baptiſm* made Diſciples, and accordingly that *Baptiſm*

is the only ordinary way of making *Diſciples*, I ſhall take occaſion hereafter very largely to prove to you.

And thus I have particularly and Impartially Conſider'd thoſe few Texts (which yet are all we find in Scripture) which ſpeak of *Chriſt*'s or of his *Diſciples* Baptizing during his Life-time; and the Sum of them is this, That Jeſus's Diſciples Baptized, and made by Baptizing them, more Diſciples than *John*. The Words are not They were *Baptized* all that *Believed*, or all that *Repented*; Nay, nor all Men only, but all in general, not a Child of Man excepted: And now, Sir, whether the Scripture be thus far againſt, or for *Infant-Baptiſm*, judge you.

And here I will add one thing more, which wou'd be a great Satisfaction to my own mind in this Caſe of Baptizing *Infants*, tho' there was nothing more to be ſaid for it.

Know then, Sir, and I tell it you from undoubted Authority, that Children were Baptized as well as Circumciſed in the *Jewiſh* Church long before our Saviour's Coming in the Fleſh.

"The *Jews* report, ſays Dr. *Taylor*, That the "World took up the Doctrine of *Baptiſms* in Re"membrance that the Iniquity of the Old World "was purged by Water. *Great Exemp. P.* 175.

And indeed *Noah* and his Families being ſaved by paſſing through the Waters of the Flood

in

in the *Ark*, did Typifie and Pre-figure our being ſaved by paſſing thro' the Waters of *Baptiſm* in the *Ark* of the Church, for ſo St. *Peter*, *In the Ark* (ſays he) *were Eight Souls ſaved by Water. The like Figure whereunto even Baptiſm doth alſo now ſave us.* 1 *Pet.* 3. 20, 21.

And as for that *Infant-Baptiſm* which was practiſed of Old in the *Jewiſh* Church, 'tis by their own beſt Writers made as Ancient as *Moſes*, and "deduc'd by them (ſays Dr. *Towerſon*) from that "Command of God whereby *Moſes* was Enjoyned to Sanctifie the *Iſraelites*, and cauſe them to "waſh their Cloaths againſt that time that God "declared from *Mount Sinai*, That Legal Covenant which they were then to enter into. Dr. *Towerſon* of the Sacrament of *Bapt. Pag.* 13.

And the Apoſtle himſelf, tells us, of theſe *Iſraelites*, That *they were all Baptized into Moſes in the Cloud, and in the Sea*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. They were all, Men, Women, and Children, ſo *Baptized.*

And you know, Good Sir, that when God did ſafely lead theſe Children of *Iſrael*, thro' the *Red-Sea*, he thereby figured his Holy Baptiſm.

"And therefore as they, Men, Women and "Children, were *Baptized* into *Moſes* by the "*Cloud* above, and the *Sea* beneath, ſo (ſays "Dr. *Taylor*) are all Perſons now, Men, Women and Children to be *Baptized* into Chriſt "by the Spirit from above, and the Water below; and the ſame Excellent Author moſt "truly

" truly adds, That it was the design of the A-
" postle in that Discourse, 1 *Cor.* 10. To repre-
" sent that the *Fathers* and *We* were equal as
" to the Privileges of the Covenant, and that
" as we do not exceed them, so neither do they
" exceed us, nor their Children ours. *Great Exemp.* Pag. 176.

And in short, When our Saviour first Instituted his Baptism amongst that very People who had then such an Ancient Custom to Baptize Infants, had he made any Exception against that their Custom; had he excluded such Babes from his Baptism as they admitted to theirs, we should certainly have heard something of it.

I am sure that their *Infant-Circumcision* was not laid aside without great Noise and Struggle, and therefore that their *Infant-Baptism* should be so easily quitted without so much as one word said either for or against it, is what, I profess to you, I cannot easily believe.

Nay, but I am hereby very much confirm'd in my Belief that Infants were as well admitted to our Lord's Baptism when he Baptized in *Judea*, as they then were and for a long time before had been Baptized in the *Jewish-Church*.

And thus, Sir, I have Briefly shewn you what was done by our Lord and by his Disciples in his Life-time, in this Case of Baptizing.

And, II.

II. I will (God willing) enquire again what we find in Scripture to have been done in this Caſe by the Apoſtles after our Lord's Aſcenſion.

But of this in my next, which ſhall be haſtened from,

Sir,

June 26. 1698. *Your* &c.

T. H.

LETTER V.

SIR,

I Proceed to enquire what I can find in Scripture to have been done in the Caſe of Baptizing by our Lord's Apoſtles after his Aſcenſion into Heaven.

Now the firſt that we read of to have been Baptiz'd by them were the *Three thouſand Converts*, *Acts* 2. 41. But that none of theſe were Children is moſt confidently affirm'd, becauſe 'tis there ſaid of them that *they gladly receiv'd the Word*, &c.

&c. which indeed is a very plauſible way of Arguing; but yet 'tis a very ill way, and not to be allow'd of in our Interpretations of ſuch Scripture-Paſſages.

For there is nothing more common than for the Scripture to ſpeak of Children together with adult Perſons, and yet to add ſuch things as the Children will not be thought capable of: As for Example.

St. *Paul* ſpeaks of Infants as well as of Men and Women, when he aſſures us, that *We muſt all appear before the Judgment-Seat of Chriſt, and every one of us receive for the good or evil done in our bodies*; I ſay, St. *Paul* ſpeaks of Infants among the reſt, tho' one half of what he there ſpeaks, cannot be underſtood of them, namely, That they ſhall receive for the *good* or *evil done in their bodies*, who never liv'd in their Bodies to do either Good or Evil.

Sir, you argue, that none of the Three thouſand baptiz'd, *Acts* 2. were Children, becauſe 'tis ſaid of them, *That they gladly received the word, and continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles doctrine*, which are things that Children could not do.

And juſt at the ſame rate it may be argu'd, That no Infants ſhall appear at the laſt Day before the Judgment-Seat of Chriſt, becauſe 'tis ſaid of them that ſhall then and there appear, that *they muſt receive for the good or evil done in their bodies*

dies; which are things that Infants could not do.

And again, I have not the leaſt doubt but there will be Children and Infants at the Laſt Day, placed among the Bleſſed Saints at the Right-hand of the Judge, and yet I know what the Judge will then ſay to thoſe on his Right-hand, *I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat*, &c.

But now, as you are pleas'd to reaſon the Caſe, That there were no Children among the Three thouſand baptized, *Acts* 2. becauſe ſuch things are immediately added to have been done by them, as no Children could poſſibly do, *viz.* That *they continu'd ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine, &c.* juſt after the ſame manner it may be reaſon'd, That there ſhall be no Infants among the Saints at the Right-hand of the Judge at the Laſt Day, becauſe ſuch things will immediately be added to have been done by them as no Infants could poſſibly do, *viz. I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat*, &c.

But, good Sir, Infants will certainly make up a great part of the Bleſſed Train at the Right-hand of the Judge, though the Judge cannot ſay to them, *I was an hungred, and ye gave me Meat*: And ſo there might be many Infants among the Three thouſand that were baptized, tho' it cannot be ſaid of them that *they continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles doctrine.*

For

For ſo you plainly ſee that Infants may be ſpoken of together with adult Perſons, though ſome things may be added which the Infant-part of the Company are no ways capable of.

And accordingly that there were Infants or Children among the Three thouſand baptized, as aforeſaid, we have yet this further Reaſon to convince us; becauſe when they were there perſwaded to be baptized with this Promiſe of having the Holy Ghoſt given them, 'tis expreſly added, *The promiſe is to you and to your Children, Acts* 2. 38, 39. But of this more largely before I have done

I proceed therefore to the next that we read of to have been baptized; and They were the *Samaritans*, baptized by St. *Philip*, *Acts* 8. 12. and there indeed it is ſaid, that *They were baptized both Men and Women*; and therefore ſurely, ſay you, had any Children been then baptized, it would have been added, That they were baptized Men, Women, and Children. No, Dear Sir, there was no need of any ſuch Addition; for conſider, I beſeech you, the Scripture-way of ſpeaking; Even all Ages of both Sexes, Children and Infants together with the Elder Sort are expreſs'd in Scripture by *Men* and *Women*, as Mr. *Horn* has particularly noted in *Joſhua* 8. 25, 26. and *Judges* 9. 49, 51. which Texts you may conſult at your Leiſure, and I will take leave to go on.

The

The next we meet with in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, to have been baptized, was the *Eunuch*, baptized by St. *Philip*, *Acts* 8. 38. and from their going *down to the Water*, is there a great Objection rais'd againſt our *Mode of Baptizing* by *Sprinkling*, or *Pouring on* Water; but this I have already anſwer'd.

In the next Chapter was St. *Paul* baptized by *Ananias*, and I think he was baptized in the Houſe of *Judas*; and you will not, I hope, from hence conclude that he alſo was *Dipt*.

In the next Chapter again we find St. *Peter* commanding *Cornelius* and them that were with him to be baptized; but pray, Sir, Obſerve the Reaſon, *Can any man forbid water that theſe ſhould not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghoſt as well as we? Acts* 10. 47, 48. And may it not as well be argu'd, *Can any man forbid Water that Children ſhou'd not be Baptized, who receive the Holy Ghoſt as well as we? But of this more hereafter.*

In the next place we read that *Lydia was Baptized and her Houſhold*, *Acts*, 16. 14, 15. Where I obſerve, that whatever qualifications are mention'd to have given *Lydia* a right to Baptiſm, yet we read not any thing of any of her Houſhold, but that they were Baptized; Nay, and after their Baptiſm ſays *Lydia* to the Apoſtles, *If ye have Judged Me faithful to the Lord*, &c. She ſays not, if ye have Judged Us faithfull, but

but only Me which implies (according to our Adverſaries beſt way of reaſoning) That only *Lydia*, and that none of the reſt were Believers. So that thus far I am ſure here is nothing againſt Infants being a part of her Family. But,

Sir, I muſt admire the Author of your little Book, and the profound diſcoveries he has made in his Notes upon this Text to convince us, that *Lydia* had no Husband, and Conſequently no Children. But this wou'd not follow, unleſs he cou'd prove her to have been no Widow neither; and therefore by dint of mighty Argument he'll make us farther know that ſhe was no Widow. And I muſt not conceal his All-convincing Reaſon, which is this, She cou'd be no Widow, becauſe ſhe is called a Woman, whereas Widows in Scripture are called Widows, as the Widow of *Sarepta*, &c. A moſt wonderful Argument indeed! But, Sir, When I think on't again, The wonder ceaſes, becauſe I find the very Widow of *Sarepta* call'd a *Woman*, 1 *King.* 17. 17, 24. Yea, I find in Scripture one call'd a Woman, who had been ſeven times a Widow; for after ſhe had Buried no fewer than Seven Huſbands, 'tis expreſly ſaid, That *laſt of all Died the Woman alſo.* Sir, I ſhould have deſpis'd to take notice of ſuch Childiſh Reaſonings as theſe, had I not obſerv'd with what confidence they are written to impoſe upon Vulgar Underſtandings.

In

In the 33d verſe of the ſame Chapter we read of the *Jaylor* that *he was Baptized and all his*, The Original words are οἱ αὐτῦ πάντες, and ſignifie *all that were of him*, or in other words his *Off-ſpring*. But 'tis objected that they were not Children, becauſe 'tis imply'd in the next verſe that they were all Believers and rejoyced, *The Jaylor rejoyced, believing in God with all his Houſe*. To which Mr. *Horn* has anſwer'd that the Original words may be interpreted as ſpeaking of none but the *Jaylor* himſelf, and may ſignifie Word for Word that he rejoyced Houſe-wholly (παναικὶ) he having believed in God. He rejoyced Houſe-wholly that is, upon the Account of his whole Houſe that all were Baptized as well as himſelf. And certainly his thus rejoycing upon the account of his Houſe may perſwade us that there were ſome in it that were very near and dear to him, and Theſe undoubtedly were (the οἱ αὐτῦ) his Off-ſpring or Children Baptized with himſelf. See Mr. *Horn's Cauſe of Infants*, &c. *p.* 58.

Again, *Acts*, 18. 8. We find ſome *Corinthians* Baptized, and *Acts* 19. 3, 5. 'Tis ſaid of ſome who had been Baptized unto *John*'s Baptiſms, that they *were Baptized in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*. And theſe laſt indeed were about Twelve Men, but that all the *Corinthians* were Men and no Children will not ſo eaſily be prov'd: 'Tis true 'tis ſaid that they *heard and believed*, and yet there might be Children among them for all

that, as I have juſt now ſhewn, there will be Infants in the happy number at the Right-hand of the Judge when it ſhall be ſaid to them, *I was an hungred and ye gave me Meat.* Tho' Infants, I ſay, cou'd not do this, yet this will be ſaid of the whole Bleſſed number whereof Infants will be a part.

And ſo the Scripture very frequently aſcribes ſuch things to Companies, as are not within the power of Children to do, and yet thoſe very Companies may conſiſt of Children as well as of Elder People.

All *Judah* ſtood before the Lord with their little Ones, their Wives and their Children, when *Jahaziel* ſaid to them that they ſhou'd do, yea and 'tis alſo ſaid that they did much greater things than cou'd be affirm'd of Children, 2 *Chron.* 20. 13, 14, 15, 16, &c.

And thus, I ſay again, that Children may be in a Company even tho' ſuch things are ſaid to be done by that Company as the Children in it are not capable of doing.

Laſtly, St. *Paul* tells his *Corinthians* that he Baptized none of them but *Criſpus and Gaius and the Houſhold of Stephanas*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 14, 16.

And here I will obſerve that of all the Houſeholds that we find to have been Baptiz'd, there is not the leaſt exception as to Infants or Babes, nor can I believe them to have been all Barren and Childleſs Families, becauſe there's not the leaſt

leaſt Syllable or Circumſtance denoting any ſuch thing.

I know 'tis ſaid, that there were no Children in this Houſhold Baptized by St. *Paul*, becauſe no Children are mention'd; and may not I as well ſay, that here was no Faith, no Repentance, nor any ſuch thing as ſome contend for to qualifie for *Baptiſm? viz.* Becauſe here is no mention made of any ſuch thing; and again, for the ſame reaſon that ſome deny there were Children, another may deny that there were Servants, and another, that there were any Relations, and all by the ſame Rule, and for the ſame reaſon ſtill, and ſo at length, at this rate of Denying any Children to have been in it, may the Houſhold of *Stephanas* be deny'd into an Houſhold of mere No-Bodies.

And this, Sir, is all that I find in the New Teſtament to have been practis'd by the Apoſtles in this Caſe of *Baptizing* after our Lord's Aſcenſion into Heaven; and in ſo ſhort an account as this is, we have as clear hints of their Baptizing Children as can well be expected. For,

You, Sir, may venture to aſſure your ſelf, that the Scripture has acquainted us but with little, very little in Compariſon of what was really done by the Apoſtles in this Caſe, even by thoſe very Apoſtles who had receiv'd the Command to Baptize all Nations; Nay, but as St. *John* tells us, that over and above the Scripture-accounts there

are many other things that *Jesus* did, so I will add that there were many other things which his Apostles did, *which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the World it self could not contain the Books that should be written*, John 21, 25.

As in this particular case of *Baptizing*, we do not in all the New Testament find the Hundredth part of what the Apostles did; so that if we must believe no more in this matter, than what the Scriptures tell us of the Acts of the Apostles, we must believe but very little, and not a word of above two thirds of these Apostles; not a syllable of St. *Andrew*, or St. *Thomas*, or St. *Simon*, or St. *Jude*, or St. *James*, or St. *Bartholomew*, or St. *Matthias*, or St. *Matthew*, for of their, or of any of their going out into the world to Baptize we must not speak a word, if we must say nothing but what we can quote Chapter and Verse for.

And yet, Sir, Notwithstanding this profound Silence of Scripture, I verily believe that no Man who has read Books can doubt but a credible account has been, and may be given of the Travels of these Apostles, and of the Nations Discipl'd and Baptized by them. The ancient Writers have some of them been pretty punctual in these matters, and in the Histories of all Countreys 'tis seldom or never omitted by what Apostle, or by whom the Christian Religion was first planted among them. And

And unleſs all theſe Hiſtorians who agree in theſe matters can be ſuppos'd to have laid their Heads together (tho' as far diſtant from one another as the *Eaſt* is from the *Weſt*) yet, I ſay, unleſs they can be ſuppos'd to have laid their Heads together, to Cheat and Impoſe upon the World, we have no reaſon to disbelieve their reports; But then, Sir, I add, that we have no reaſon to disbelieve *Infant-Baptiſm*, for we have the very ſame Hiſtories, and the very ſame Authors bearing witneſs to this, who bear witneſs to the other matters.

For Inſtance, 'tis generally agreed among Writers, that Chriſtianity was firſt planted in the *Eaſtern Indies* by St. *Thomas*, and 'tis very well known that the Chriſtians there are to this day call'd St. *Thomas-Chriſtians*, and 'tis altogether as well known that they do (as they have always done) practiſe *Infant-Baptiſm*.

I cou'd trace the other Apoſtles into the many Cities and Nations, whither they ſeverally went Diſcipling and Baptizing, and every-where find *Infant-Baptiſm* receiv'd and continu'd as an Apoſtolical practice. But I'll not lead you too far into theſe Hiſtorical accounts, which yet we muſt be oblig'd to, or elſe we ſhall know but very little of the Acts of the greateſt part of the Apoſtles, for what they did, into what Cities and Nations they Travel'd, what Diſciples

they made, whom they Baptiz'd is not written in Scripture.

But now, Sir, ſuppoſe ſome wild *Theiſt* or *Atheiſt*, in purſuance of their Miſchievous deſign to diſcredit the Apoſtles, ſhould come and tell you, that the greateſt part of them, were a pack of Lazy Drones; who, though they were under the obligation of a Command to Diſciple and Baptize all Nations, yet never mov'd a Foot upon that great Errand, did not the leaſt Hand's-turn in all that weighty Buſineſs; pray, Good Sir, what Anſwer would you make? How would you vindicate the Apoſtles from ſo black a charge? I am ſure that all Scripture-Evidence would here fail you; you could not quote Scripture in the defence of one half of them; but how then would you ſtop the Mouths of their Accuſers? Why, Sir, You muſt be beholden to juſt the evidence we have for Infant-Baptiſm's being practis'd by the Apoſtles; for by all the Authority whereby you could ſilence their Accuſers, and prove to 'em the Apoſtles Travels, and the Converſions that they every where made all the wide World over, even by all that Authority, I ſay, do we prove Infants to have been Baptized by them.

And further, ſuppoſe an *Atheiſt* ſhould fly in the face of our Bleſſed Saviour himſelf, and Blaſphemouſly tell you that he was a falſe Prophet, who pretended to foretell ſuch things concerning the Deſtruction of the *Jewiſh* Church and

and State as never came to paſs, though he poſitively propheſy'd that That very *Generation ſhould not paſs away till all theſe ſhould be fulfill'd.* Suppoſe, I ſay, an *Atheiſt* ſhould ſay thus, Good Sir, I muſt beſeech you to tell me what you would anſwer, or how you would clear our bleſſed Lord and Saviour from the foul Aſperſion, you could not in this caſe have any help from Scripture; No, but you would be forc'd to appeal to the Hiſtorians of that and of the following Ages, and particularly to that moſt admirable Hiſtorian, *Joſephus*, to ſhew how theſe Predictions and Prophecies of our Saviour were accompliſh'd, and moſt wonderfully and punctually fulfill'd about forty Years after our Saviour's Crucifixion. Well, Sir, and we have altogether as good evidence in the firſt Writers of the *Chriſtian* Church for Infant-Baptiſm, as we have for the Accompliſhment of our Saviour's Prophecies; and as you muſt prove our Saviour to have been a true Prophet in that Caſe, even ſo do we prove Infants to have been Baptized in the Apoſtolical Ages.

Once more, ſome deny that the Apoſtles Baptiz'd any Infants, and ſuppoſe a *Quaker* (who is againſt all Water-Baptiſm) ſhould deny that they Baptiz'd either Men or Women, I know you would ſay that we have ſufficient Proof of this in the *Acts of the Apoſtles.* Oh, but, Sir, You need not be told that theſe *Quakers* (many of them) are a ſort of unmannerly fellows, that

diſreſpect and diſparage the very Scriptures themſelves, and perhaps they'll ask you, Who writ that Book in the New Teſtament call'd *The Acts of the Apoſtles?* Of what Authority is it? Was the Author of it an Inſpir'd Writer? and what can you ſay, why we are bound to believe what we find Written therein more than in any other Old Book? And now, pray, Sir, ſhould a moroſe *Quaker* thus put you to't to prove the Authority of the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, how wou'd you do it? Truly you muſt anſwer, that we have the whole Primitive Church bearing witneſs to it, that it was written by an Inſpired Author, *viz.* by St. *Luke*, and that it has ever been receiv'd as Canonical Scripture throughout the Univerſal Church of Chriſt, diſperſed over the face of the whole Earth. And this indeed is ſufficient evidence to a Wiſe-Man. But then we have the very ſame evidence for Infant-Baptiſm's being an Apoſtolical practice; we have the Univerſal Church of Chriſt bearing witneſs thereto in all places, yea, and at all times, for the firſt fifteen Hundred Years after Chriſt, without exception.

Sir, That Infant-Baptiſm was the Univerſal Practice of the Holy *Catholick* Church, and that no time can be ſhewed on this ſide the Apoſtles when it began, is ſo manifeſtly and clearly prov'd from the beſt and moſt Authentick Writers of all Ages, that ſome of our learned'ſt Adverſaries

verſaries have had more Conſcience than to deny it.

Menno, One of the moſt Learned of the *Anabaptiſts*, (as the Author of the Caſe of *Infant-Baptiſm* tells us from *Caſſander*) acknowledg'd *Infant-Baptiſm* to be as Old as the Times of the Apoſtles, and therefore he was forc'd in the defence of his cauſe to invent the Story, That though *Infant-Baptiſm* was firſt taught in the Apoſtles Times, yet that it was then taught by falſe Apoſtles, and falſe Teachers; which proof-leſs Story is Learnedly and largely anſwer'd by the ſaid Author of the *Caſe of Infant-Baptiſm*, pag. 47, 48, 49, 50.

And our excellent Dr. *Falkner* has theſe Words "The Chriſtian Church, in the firſt A-"ges thereof, and in a Continued Succeſſion "from thence to this time, hath admitted In-"fants to be Baptized, and thought it ſelf bound "ſo to do. And this he proves by ſeveral plain Teſtimonies out of St. *Auſtin*, St. *Cyprian*, *Origen*, and from the famous *African* Council, and concludes that divers other Fathers and Councils might be added, "to manifeſt the Univerſal "Reception of *Infant-Baptiſm* in the *Catholick* "Church. But this, ſaith he, having been clear-"ly and ſufficiently evidenc'd by the Hiſtorical "*Theſes* of *Voſſius* upon this Subject of *Pædobap-"tiſm*, I ſhall refer him thither who wou'd have "more large and ample Proof hereof. *Treatiſe concer-*

concerning Reproaching, &c. pages 285. 286.

And now, Good Sir, have patience with me till I ſhall briefly ſumm up what I have ſaid in this long Letter, and I will conclude.

I have ſhewn you how little we read in Scripture of what The Apoſtles did in this Caſe of Baptizing, after they had receiv'd the Command to Baptize all Nations, and likewiſe what clear hints we have even in that little of their *Baptizing Infants*; but then I have added, that as we find larger accounts of the Apoſtles Travels and of the Nations Converted by them in the primimitive Writers, ſo, that from the ſame Writers we are more fully aſſur'd that *Infant-Baptiſm* was an Apoſtolical Practice.

And you, Sir, I hope will not be ſo vain as to deſpiſe this Evidence, without which you can never prove that the greateſt part of the Apoſtles Baptiz'd either Man, Woman, or Child. Without which you cannot prove to an *Atheiſt* that our Saviour was a True Prophet. Without which you cannot prove to a Sullen *Quaker* the Authority of that very Book (in which we have ſo may Proofs againſt them of Baptiſm in general,) *viz. The Acts of the Apoſtles*.

And thus I have enquired into the Apoſtolical practice in this Caſe of Baptizing *Infants*, and, I thank God, that the more I have

enquir'd,

enquir'd, I have found the more and greater Satisfaction in the Caſe.

In the next place I am to enquire what Authority they had for this practice of theirs, that is, I am to enquire whether I can find in all the New Teſtament that *Infant-Baptiſm* was any where Taught or Commanded. But I preſume you'll be Content to truſt me for this, till I may have a farther Opportunity, and in the mean while I am,

Sir,

July 2. 1698.

Your &c.

T. H.

LET-

LETTER VI.

Dear Sir,

THE Second part of your great Objection againſt *Infant-Baptiſm* is this, *You find not in Scripture that any Infants were* COMMANDED *to be Baptized.*

Now to this I cou'd give you this ſhort Anſwer: When the Diſciples of Chriſt made and Baptized more Diſciples than *John*, John 4. 1, 2. Let any Man living tell me where the Command is written in Scripture, which gave theſe Diſciples of our Lord Authority to Baptize at that time; and I will undertake to ſhew you, that the very ſame Command oblig'd them to Baptize *Infants:* This I do affirm, that they had then as much Command to Baptize *Infants*, as they had to Baptize either *Men* or *Women:* And do you, Sir, make the tryal if you pleaſe. Go and learn from Scripture where theſe Diſciples had any Command then to Baptize the Elder ſort, and if you do not find the ſame Command obliging them to Baptize *Children* alſo, I do here freely tell you that I dare yield you the Cauſe.

But to give a more particular Anſwer to this (as I have done to the former) part of your Objection.

Firſt,

Firſt, I will enquire from Scripture whether *Infant-Baptiſm* was taught by our Saviour in his Life-time.

Secondly, Whether it was Taught or Commanded by him after his Death and Reſurrection, before he Aſcended into Heaven. And,

Thirdly, Whether it was taught by any of his Apoſtles after his Aſcenſion.

(1.) I will make it my buſineſs at this time to Enquire from Scripture whether *Infant-Baptiſm* was taught by our Saviour in his Life-time.

Sir, The *Sadducees* cou'd not find in all the five Books of *Moſes* ſo much as one ſingle Text which taught the Doctrin of a Reſurrection, and therefore they Confidently deny'd the thing, and warmly diſputed it with our Bleſſed Lord and Saviour himſelf. And you may be pleas'd to ſee how our Lord confuted and convinc'd them by a Text of Scripture which they had overlook'd, *Mark* 12. 26.

Have you not read, ſaid he, *in the Book of Moſes, how God ſpake unto him, Saying, I am the God of Abraham, the God of Iſaac, and the God of Jacob?* to which he added; *But God is not the God of the Dead, but of the Living.* And this was our Saviour's *Scripture-Proof* of a Reſurrection, and from theſe very words by juſt Reaſonings and Conſequences did he make the Truth of that great Doctrin appear to thoſe very

Sad-

Sadducees themſelves, who had ſo long and ſo ſtiffly oppos'd it.

It muſt indeed be acknowledg'd, that it requir'd a Piercing Eye to find out a Reſurrection in theſe words, *I am the God of Abraham*, &c. And yet ſo it was: The Reſurrection was a Conſequence that our Lord Himſelf then drew from them, and the Conſequence was acknowledged to be good *Scripture-Proof*, and the *Sadducees* were wiſer than to Object againſt it.

This I have obſerv'd to let you ſee, that there may be *Scripture-Proof* of a thing, tho' every Eye cannot diſcern it; and that tho' we cannot always produce plain and expreſs words of Scripture in the defence of a Doctrin, yet if we can prove it by right and genuine Conſequence, we do as much as our Saviour himſelf did in the Caſe of a Reſurrection; and I hope that in good Manners and Civility to our Great Lord, you will allow ſuch *Proof* as he made uſe of to be good and ſufficient. But further,

There were a ſort of Hereticks of Old call'd *Macedonians*, (and a ſpawn of them we have ſtill amongſt us) who deny'd the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, and their great Cry was; Where do you read in Scripture that the Holy Ghoſt is God? And I do aſſure you, Sir, that it was truly Confeſs'd that there is no ſuch *Scripture-Text*, no ſuch expreſs words in the whole *Bible*; it is not expreſly aſſerted *(in terminis)* either in the Old

Old or New Teſtament, that the Holy Ghoſt is God; But what then? There are in Scripture ſuch things ſaid of the Holy Ghoſt, as by undoubted Conſequence prove him to be God; as to give you but one Inſtance of an Hundred: The Holy Ghoſt is ſaid to be Omnipreſent, *Pſal.* 139. 7. and from hence it neceſſarily follows as a very plain Conſequence, that he muſt needs be God, becauſe God only is Omnipreſent.

And now, Sir, with a like manner of *Proof* I will fall upon the matter in hand. Tho' we find not in Scripture any ſuch expreſs Command as this, *That Infants ſhall be Baptized*; yet we find ſuch things given in Charge concerning them, as neceſſarily Imply, that they ought to be Baptized; that is to ſay, we find in Scripture that *Children* ought to be admitted into the Church of Chriſt, and we there likewiſe find that there is no other ordinary way of admitting into that Church but by *Baptiſm.*

And to give you full ſatisfaction in this matter, I will here undertake briefly to prove, That our Bleſſed Lord and Saviour did in his Life-time teach, both that Children are to be admitted into his Church, and that they are to be admitted by Baptiſm.

That *Children* were admitted into God's Church of old, is as well known as that they were then *Circumcis'd.* And what, I pray, is the *Chriſtian-Church* but that old Church Reform'd?

The

The Root and Stock are ſtill the ſame, tho' as for the Branches, ſome, *viz.* the *Jews*, were *lopped off*, and others, *viz.* the *Gentiles*, are *graffed in*, as you may read at large, *Rom.* 11. 16, 17, 18.

" Chriſtianity indeed (as one ſpeaks very well) " is *Judaiſm* explain'd into its Spiritual Senſe and " meaning, and hence it is that the *Chriſtians* in " the *New Teſtament* are called *Jews*; that is, Re- " form'd *Jews*, *Rev.* 2. 9. and ſometimes the *If-* " *rael of God*, Gal. 6. 16. and ſometimes the " *Children of Abraham*, Gal. 3. 7. And hence it " is that the *Chriſtian-Church* is called the *New-* " *Jeruſalem*, becauſe it is the *Old Jeruſalem* (or " *Jewiſh Church*) renew'd and enlarg'd. *Rev.* 3. 12.

But now, Good Sir, ſuppoſe that our Church ſhould be taken down to the very Foundation, and built again a great deal larger and more Glorious than now it is; What think you? Might we not then take our *Children* along with us to our Church as well as we do now? Certainly the Re-building and Beautifying it wou'd take away no one's privilege of entring into it.

In a reſembling manner, there was indeed a great Reformation made by our Saviour in the Church of God, a great deal taken away, and a great deal added, and almoſt the whole every ways alter'd for the better; but what is all this to any ones privilege of entering into it? Nay, but certainly as *Children* were ad-

admitted into the Church before that Reformation, ſo are they to be admitted ſtill, unleſs it be a part of the Reformation to exclude them.

And thus, upon the whole matter, 'tis very plain, that unleſs our Bleſſed Saviour has FORBIDDEN *Infants* to be admitted into his Church, they are ſtill to be admitted whether he has COMMANDED their Admiſſion or no.

And here I might fix the Controverſie, and juſtifie their Admiſſion, till you can prove that our Lord has Forbidden it, which I dare venture to ſay you will never be able to do; Nay, but our Lord has not only not forbidden their Admiſſion into the Church, but he has expreſly Taught and Commanded it. For,

Firſt, That *Children* ought to be admitted into his Church, he has expreſly taught in that Celebrated Text, *Suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Which Text was ſpoken by way of Reprimand to his Diſciples, who wou'd have kept *Children* from him; and therefore when he reprov'd them and ſaid, *Suffer little Children to come unto me*, he muſt needs mean ſuch *Children* as they wou'd have kept from him; but theſe were ſuch as were brought unto him, and ſuch as he took up in his Arms, and were therefore little *Children* in a literal Senſe.

The words indeed are, *Suffer little Children to come unto me*; and therefore ſay ſome, let them ſtay then till they can come: But if this was our Saviour's meaning, might not his Diſciples very readily have anſwered? Lord, we have not hinder'd any ſuch from coming that cou'd come, all that we have done was only to Rebuke thoſe that brought their *Children*.

And thus if Children might not be brought to Chriſt, but if they were to be kept back till they themſelves cou'd come to him, I cannot ſee what the Diſciples had here done for our Lord to be diſpleaſed at; and yet the Text ſays poſitively, *That he was much diſpleaſed, and ſaid, ſuffer little Children to come unto me*, Mark 10. 14. And therefore unleſs we have no more Grace or Wit than to ſay, that he was diſpleas'd at nothing; we muſt allow, that the *Children* whom he wou'd have ſuffer'd to come to him, were ſuch as his Diſciples would have kept from him, and theſe were ſuch as were brought unto him, and ſuch as he took up in his Arms.

But perhaps you'll ſay, What then is the meaning of the words TO COME UNTO ME? *Suffer little Children to come unto me:* Sir, I find an Anſwer made to this by Mr. *Walker*, *viz.* "That to come unto Chriſt, ſignifies, to be-"come a Diſciple of Chriſt; for ſo when our "Saviour ſaith, *Come unto me all ye that Labour*, "his meaning is, become Diſciples to me, *Mat.* "11.28.

" 11. 28. And again, when it is ſaid, *Behold Je-*
" *ſus Baptizeth, and all Men come to him*; The
" meaning is, that they all become his Diſ-
" ciples, *John* 3. 26. And again, *Ye will not*
" *come to me*, ſaid our Lord, That is, *ye will not*
" *become my Diſciples*, John 5. 4.

The ſame excellent Author has obſerv'd from Dr. *Hammond*, that we may read the word *Proſelyte* in the very Original Text, *Mat.* 19. 14. For there the Original words are ἰλθεῖν πρός, which turn'd into *Engliſh* do even Compoſe and make up the word *Proſelyte*; and ſo in St. *Matthew*, I ſay the Original words are, *Suffer little Children* (ἰλθεῖν πρός, that is,) *to be Proſelytes to me*, or to be my Diſciples: For to be a Proſelyte, and to be a Diſciple is the ſame thing. As when our Lord ſaid to the *Scribes* and *Phariſees* that they had *Compaſs'd Sea and Land to make one Proſelyte*; the meaning is, that they had compaſs'd Sea and Land to make one Diſciple.

And thus has our Lord very plainly taught us that little *Children* muſt be ſuffer'd to become his Diſciples; yea, and he farther adds, that they are *not to be forbidden*, and then gives ſuch a Reaſon for it, as may put the matter beyond all Diſpute, *For of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*: That is, little *Children* are not to be forbidden becoming his Diſciples; becauſe of ſuch, even of ſuch as were brought unto him *is the Kingdom of God*; both the Kingdom of Grace, which

is the Church Militant here on Earth, and the Kingdom of Glory, which is the Church Triumphant in Heaven.

And thus we have a plain Scripture Text, wherein our Bleſſed Lord has very clearly taught us, that little *Children* are to be *ſuffer'd*, and not to be *forbidden* being admitted into his Church.

And this is according to that ancient Prophecy, foretelling the Converſion of the *Gentiles* to Chriſtianity. *Thus ſaith the Lord God, I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and ſet up my Standard to the People, and they ſhall bring thy Sons in their Arms, and thy Daughters ſhall be carryed upon their ſhoulders*, Iſa. 49. 22.

And this is no more than what our Lord himſelf did fortell, when he ſo plainly intimated, that *there ſhould be Lambs in his Flock, as well as Sheep*, John 21. 15.

But, Sir, if you wou'd ſee more, and larger Proof of this matter, you may conſult Mr. *Baxter*'s Book called *Plain Scripture-proof of Infants Church-Memberſhip and Baptiſm*, wherein he has proved that *Children* ought to be admitted into Chriſt's Church by no fewer than Six and twenty diſtinct Arguments.

Well: But then the next Queſtion is, How are they to be admitted? I Anſwer by Baptiſm, for ordinarily there is no other way of Admiſſion, as I ſhall prove by and by.

But

But here I will take notice of an Objection that I find has been often ſtarted upon this occaſion; If little *Children* are to be admitted into Chriſt's Church, and if there be no other way of admitting them but by *Baptiſm*, Why then did not our Lord Baptize thoſe *Children* that were brought unto him? I anſwer, Becauſe our Lord never Baptized any with *Water*. But then it may be ask'd again, Why did he not Command his Diſciples to Baptize them? I Anſwer again, *Becauſe his Hour was not yet come*; for he never, that we read of, Commanded his Diſciples to Baptize any, or any to be Baptized by them till after his Death and Reſurrection.

But, Sir, Give me leave briefly to remind you of what I have obſerv'd in my firſt Letter concerning the outward and the inward part of Baptiſm, for I therein ſhewed you that the Miniſters of Chriſt do but Baptize with *Water*, which is the outward part of that Sacrament; 'Tis Chriſt himſelf who Baptizeth with the Holy Ghoſt, or with the Spirit, which is the inward part: And here I will farther obſerve, that our Lord has not ſo ty'd up himſelf to the uſe of outward means, but he can if he pleaſes, and will for juſt and wiſe Reaſons perform the inward part without them.

For thus, ſhould an *Infidel* or a *Jew* be Converted to Chriſtianity, and earneſtly deſire *Baptiſm*, and ſhould the Miniſters of Chriſt, to whom

he has the opportunity of applying himſelf for that purpoſe, be all ſo unfaithful as to refuſe to Baptize him, yea tho' he ſought and begg'd of them ſo to do with Tears; In ſuch a Caſe as this where the outward *Baptiſm* with *Water* was ſo far from being ſlighted, that it was earneſtly deſir'd, and yet cou'd not be had upon any terms whatſoever; In ſuch a Caſe as this (I ſay,) I cannot think that the unfaithfulneſs of Chriſt's Miniſters in diſpenſing the outward part of the Sacrament would hinder our Lord from doing the inward part, which is to Baptize with the Spirit.

And this ſeems to have been the Caſe of the little *Children* brought unto him; *His Diſciples rebuked thoſe that brought them*, and wou'd not by any means have had them come unto Chriſt, or become his Diſciples: And for this our Lord (ἠγανάκτησε) was very much diſpleaſed.

And in this great diſpleaſure he ſeems to have intimated thus much to them; That tho' they or any other of his Miniſters ſhould at any time refuſe to admit ſuch for Diſciples, whom he would have admitted, and ſhould therefore refuſe to do the outward ſolemn part of Admiſſion as they ought to do, yet this wou'd be no reaſon with him that he ſhould refuſe to do that inward part which he does himſelf perform.

And accordingly he took up thoſe very *Children* in his Arms and *bleſſed them*, viz. with Spi-

Spiritual Bleſſings, and may therefore in ſome Senſe be ſaid to have Baptized them; I mean, to have Baptized them with the Spirit, which is the inward part of Baptiſm, and the only part that Chriſt ever did or does. But,

(2.) As our Lord himſelf Received and Commanded *Children* to be receiv'd into his Church, ſo likewiſe has he plainly taught us that they are to be admitted by *Baptiſm*; yea, and that ordinarily they cannot otherwiſe be admitted, *For except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*, John 3. 5.

In which Text, By the Kingdom of God, taken in its loweſt Senſe, muſt be meant the *Chriſtian Church*, for ſo is the *Chriſtian Church* very frequently call'd in the *New Teſtament*, The *Kingdom of God, and the Kingdom of Heaven:* And this is that Kingdom of God, *viz.* The Church of Chriſt, into which there is no entrance (ordinarily) but through the Gate of *Baptiſm*.

The Text makes no exception, for tho' the *Engliſh* words are, *Unleſs a Man be born again*, yet by Man muſt be underſtood Mankind, no Sex or Age excluded; for the Original word, Tranſlated Man, ſignifies any one; (ἐάν μή τις) except any one *be Born again*, &c. Whoſoever, or of what Age ſoever they be, except they *be Born again of Water and of the Spirit*, that is, except they be Baptized, they cannot enter into

that Kingdom of God which is the *Christian Church.*

And so says the Apostle very expressly, Namely; *That we are all Baptized into that one Body of Christ, which is his Church*, 1 Cor. 12. 13. And so again, we read of being *Baptized into Christ*, that is *into Christ's Body, his Church*, Gal. 3. 27. Yea, it is there said, that *so many as have been Baptized into Christ, have put on Christ*, that is, *are incorporated into that Body whereof Christ is the Head.* And accordingly I have observ'd that there is nothing more usual in Antiquity, than for *Baptism* to be called *Ecclesiæ janua*, the Gate of the Church.

"*Baptism*, says our very Learned Bishop, is "the Door whereby we enter into the Church, "the Gate that lets us into Christ's Fold, and the "first step to Fellowship with God, and with his "People; and hence it was that the *Font* was "used to be placed at the Door or entrance of "the Church, to signifie that by this we come "into the Congregation of Christ's Disciples, "*Aqua Genitalis*, p. 447.

But I'll say no more of this, both because it is so plain, and because that it is not, that I know of, deny'd by our Adversaries; Mr. *Tombs* wou'd not deny it in all that Controversie between him and Mr. *Baxter*; Nay, but in his *Apology*, p. 58. "I grant, says he, that *Baptism* is the way and "manner of Solemn Admission into the Church;

and

and says Mr. *Grantham* in his *Friendly Epistle*, "*Baptism* is an Ordinance of Christ, necessary "to the Admission of all Men to the privileges "of his Church, *p.* 31. And the Author of your little Book notes upon 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. "that "we are by *Baptism* added to the *Bride* the *Lamb*'s "Wife, as he there calls the *Christian Church*; And again in his Note upon *Heb.* 6. 1, 2. He says, that "*Baptism* is an Ordinance for the So-"lemnization of the Soul's visible Marriage-U-"nion with Christ; that is, we are united and "wedded to Christ by *Baptism*, as we are there-"by incorporated into, and United to that "Church which is his Spouse.

But now it being so very plain (our Adversaries themselves not denying it) That there is no other visible way of Admitting into Christ's Church but by *Baptism*, it necessarily follows, that if *Children* ought (as I have before prov'd) to be admitted into that Church, then they must be Baptized into it.

Sir, Should the King Command you to carry your pretty little Child into his Presence-Chamber, you wou'd not I think once ask or question, whether you must carry him in at the door, you wou'd not I am sure be thought over-wise, shou'd you say, *My Lord, O King! Your Royal Command is that I shall bring my Son into your Presence-Chamber, but pray does your Majesty mean that I shall bring him in at the Door?*

Just

Juſt ſo, Our Lord having Commanded that *Children* ſhall be received into his Church, ſhou'd any one queſtion whether they muſt be received in at the Door (which is acknowleg'd to be *Baptiſm*) what Anſwer could he reaſonably expect but to be laugh'd at?

And thus, Sir, wonder not that there is no ſuch expreſs Command in Scripture as this, *That Infants ſhall be Baptized*; For Chriſt's Command to receive them into the Church is ſufficient; and there was no need of any ſuch ſecond Command to receive them in at the door, or to *Baptize* them. In ſhort,

Our Lord has plainly taught us, that little *Children* muſt be admitted into his Church, *Suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*, Mark 10. 14. And he has plainly taught us, that there is no other way of being admitted into his Church, but by *Baptiſm*, *Except any one be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*, John 3. 5. And from hence I frame this Argument,

There is no other way of Admiſſion into Chriſt's Church but by *Baptiſm*; But little *Children* muſt be admitted into Chriſt's Church; Therefore they muſt be *Baptized*.

And this I am perſwaded is very good Proof, becauſe 'tis ſuch Proof as our Lord made uſe of againſt the *Phariſees*, to convince them of a Re-

Reſurrection; and ſuch Proof as the Learned Defenders of our Faith are forc'd to make uſe of againſt the *Macedonians*, to convince them that the Holy Ghoſt is God.

And thus I have enquir'd how *Infant-Baptiſm* was taught by our Saviour in his Life-time.

I ſhould now in the Second Place Enquire, whether *Infant-Baptiſm* was taught by him after his Death and Reſurrection, before he Aſcended into Heaven.

But this ſhall be the Subject-matter of my Next, which you may expect by the next opportunity from,

Good Sir,

July 9. 1698.

Your &c.

T. H.

LET-

LETTER VII.

Sir,

I Go on (as I engag'd my ſelf in my Laſt) to enquire,

Secondly, Whether *Infant-Baptiſm* was Taught or Commanded by our Saviour after his Death and Reſurrection, before he Aſcended into Heaven.

And all that he Taught or Commanded concerning *Baptizing* with *Water*, at that time may be readily found in theſe two Texts, *Mat.* 28. 19. and *Mark*, 16. 15, 16. Both which it is my deſign at this time very particularly to Conſider.

Now the Words of the firſt of theſe Texts are theſe in our Engliſh Bibles. *Go ye therefore and Teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghoſt.* But, Sir, Be pleas'd to know, that the Word Tranſlated *Teach*, expreſly ſignifies *Diſciple*; *Go ye therefore Diſciple all Nations*, &c. For μαθητεύειν and μαθητὰς ποιεῖν are the ſame thing, and are rightly render'd *to make Diſciples John.* 4. 1.

For the underſtanding of which, you muſt know that our Lord (as himſelf has told us) was not *ſent but to the loſt Sheep of the Houſe of Iſrael*, *Mat.* 15. 24. His firſt endeavours were to

to Diſciple the *Jews*, and accordingly it was only in *Judea*, that any were Diſcipl'd and Baptiz'd by him or by his Diſciples during his Lifetime, as you may ſee by Comparing, *John* 3. 22. with *John* 4. 1.

Well: But now that he was a leaving the World, Now that the Partition-Wall was to be broken down, he enlarges his Commiſſion to his Diſciples, and they were not for the future to Diſciple and Baptize in the Land of *Judea* only, but they were now to Diſciple and Baptize all Nations, even the whole Gentile World, *Go ye therefore* (μαθητεύσατε) *Diſciple all Nations, Baptizing them*, &c.

Which Command and Commiſſion was firſt given to thoſe Eleven Apoſtles, *Mat.* 28. 16. who were all by Nation *Jews* or (as St. *Paul* expreſſes it) *Iſraelites* according to the Fleſh, *Rom.* 9. 3, 4. But, pray now, good Sir, Let us here Conſider, what then was, and had always been the way of Diſcipling or Proſelyting theſe Gentiles to the *Jewiſh* Church.

Truly 'tis moſt certain that when any of theſe Gentile Nations were converted to *Judaiſm*, that not only themſelves but their Children, together with themſelves, were alſo Circumcis'd and receiv'd into that Ancient Church, when the Door was open'd to take in the converted Parents, not the leaſt of their Infants (being but Eight Days old) was excluded; Nay, but no

no ſooner was the Gentile Proſelyte Circumcis'd, and made a Member of the *Jewiſh* Church, but by the very Law of Circumciſion were all his Male-Children at eight Days Old to be Circumcis'd and made Members likewiſe.

Thus ſtood the Caſe between the *Jews* and *Gentiles*; then the Gentile-Children together with their Parents were Diſcipl'd and Receiv'd into that Church of Old.

But then certainly, the Apoſtles who had ſo lately been of that very Church, and knew no other way of Diſcipling the Gentile Nations, but this of Diſcipling their Children together with their Fathers; Certainly, I ſay, theſe Apoſtles could not otherwiſe underſtand the Command to Diſciple and Baptize all Nations, than as obliging them to Diſciple and Baptize the Children as well as the Fathers.

For, here was no exception to exclude them; The Command was general, *Go, Diſciple all Nations, Baptizing them, &c.* All Nations without exception, and Children are a part of the Nations, Yea, and a very great part too, and therefore why they ſhould not be Diſcipl'd and Baptiz'd as well as any others, for my part, I can ſee no Reaſon.

Nay, but certainly, unleſs it was the will of our Lord that Children ſhould be *Diſcipl'd* and *Baptiz'd* with the reſt of the Nations, he would have ſaid ſomething to except them; he would have

have told his Apoſtles that they muſt not Diſciple or Receive ſuch Infants into the Chriſtian Church, as were Receiv'd and Diſcipl'd into their *Jewiſh* Church. No, he would have ſaid, you muſt not miſtake me, tho' I have commanded you to Diſciple and Baptize all Nations, yet I hardly mean one half of the Nations; for I do not mean ſo much as one Child or Infant belonging to them. And thus Indeed muſt our Lord be ſuppoſed to have Interpreted his Command to his Apoſtles, had he excluded Infants out of the Command.

And then again, had they been thus taught to Diſciple and Baptize no Infants, not one of all the Nations but the Adult and grown Perſons, methinks ſome Charitable Body or other in the Name of the Poor Children ſhould thus have lamented and condol'd their Caſe.

" And is it the Chriſtian Church that is now " the true Church of God? Time was, when " the *Jewiſh* Church was only ſo, and then was " the the happy time for us Poor Babes and " Children! For had our Gentile Fathers been " then Converted, Circumcis'd and Receiv'd in- " to that old Church of God, We their little In- " fants muſt not have been left behind: No, but " the Door into which our Fathers muſt have " enter'd then, would likewiſe have ſtood open " for us their Children too. But now, in the " Chriſtian Church, it ſeems, 'tis other- " wiſe; Alas, the Door is now cloſe ſhut, and barr'd

" barr'd to keep us poor Infants out; There is " no place for us in this New Church of God; " No, but tho' our Fathers are *Baptiz'd* and " *Grafted* into the good *Olive-Tree*, (as the " Chriſtian Church is call'd) Yet We, God " help us, We muſt remain Branches of the " *Wild Olive* ſtill, (as the Heathen World is " term'd.)

And thus when the Apoſtles Diſcipl'd and Baptiz'd the Gentile Nations into the Church of Chriſt, had they excluded ſuch Infants and Children as with their Parents were receiv'd into the *Jewiſh* Church of Old, the Caſe of theſe Infants and Children might juſtly have been thus Condol'd.

But our Lord, who was once an Infant himſelf, and as ſuch receiv'd into the *Jewiſh* Church, he has not indeed forbidden Infants now to be receiv'd into his; No, he has given no ſuch occaſion of Complaint againſt him, for the Command is Plain and Clear for the Diſcipling and Baptizing all Nations, not an Infant excepted that I can find.

But Sir, The grand Objection follows in the next Verſe, *Teaching them to obſerve all things Whatſoever I have commanded you*, *Mat.* 28. 20. And from hence our Adverſaries very confidently argue, That none are to be Diſcipl'd and Baptiz'd, but ſuch as are Capable of being taught too, which Infants and Children they boldly ſay are not.

But

But to this I anſwer; Firſt, 'Tis ſaid of our Lord, *That he preached Peace to them that were a far off, and to them that were nigh, Epheſ.* 2. 17. But how did he preach Peace to theſe *Epheſians* that were a far off? Why he preached Peace to them, by Teaching and Commanding his Apoſtles to Preach to them.

And thus did the Apoſtles teach Infants and Children, by Teaching and Commanding the Parents to teach them, and thus only it was, that they were to Teach all Nations when they Diſcipl'd and Baptiz'd them, *viz.* they were themſelves immediately to Teach the elder ſort, and they were to teach Children by Teaching their Parents, and others to teach them, as our Lord preached Peace to thoſe afar off, by Teaching others to Preach to them.

And, Dear Sir, I'll look the Objection once over again, The whole Command and Commiſſion given to the Apoſtles was this, *Go, Diſciple all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, Teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever I have Commanded you.* From which laſt words is the Objection rais'd, that none are to be Diſcipl'd and Baptiz'd, but ſuch as may be taught.

To which I farther anſwer, That if None are to be Diſcipl'd and Baptiz'd, but ſuch as are alſo taught, then none are to be Diſcipl'd and

Baptiz'd but ſuch as are alſo taught to obſerve all things whatſoever our Lord Commanded, for ſo ſays the Text expreſly, not only *Teaching them*, but *Teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever I have Commanded.*

But I verily believe that our Adverſaries themſelves Baptize thoſe to whom they have not taught all things whatſoever our Lord commanded. Yea, I may venture to affirm, that the *Eunuch* was Baptiz'd by *Philip*, and that the *Jaylor* and his *Houſhold* were Baptiz'd by *Paul* and *Silas*, before they had been Taught the Twentieth part of what our Lord Commmanded.

And hence 'tis very plain that the Apoſtles Diſcipl'd and Baptiz'd, thoſe to whom they did not then Teach all things whatſoever our Lord had Commanded, ſo that though theſe words, *Teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever I have Commanded you*, are added to the Command of Diſcipling and Baptizing; Yet it is not neceſſary that all ſhould be ſo taught who are Diſcipl'd and Baptiz'd.

But ſtill farther to invalidate this mighty Objection, I'll here put a plain and familiar Caſe to You. Sir,

Suppoſe You ſhould Command your *Shepherd*, ſaying, Go, Take care to preſerve my whole Flock, Driving them from off the Starving Commons into

into a better Paſture; and providing to have them well and carefully Clipt.

And then ſhould your *Shepherd* thus reaſon with Himſelf, and ſay, my Maſter's Command is to have his whole Flock preſerv'd, and driven into a better Paſture, and well Clipt; that is he means that none are to be Preſerv'd and better Paſtur'd but thoſe that are alſo to be Clipt; and therefore the Lambs that are not to be Clipt, muſt all be left upon the ſtarving Commons ſtill, nor am I to take any Care to preſerve them.

Sir, ſhould your *Shepherd* thus fooliſhly argue, I hope you ſee that his Argument in this Caſe againſt taking any care to preſerve the Lambs, would be the very ſame with our Adverſaries Argument againſt Diſcipling and Baptizing Infants. For,

May it pleaſe you, Sir, to have them ſet together: Our Lord commanded his Apoſtles, *Go, Diſciple all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, Teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever I have commanded you.*

And in like manner, You are ſuppos'd to Command your *Shepherd*, Go, take care and preſerve my whole Flock, driving them from off the ſtarving Commons into a better Paſture, and providing that they be well and carefully Clipt.

And then, as our Adverſaries argue, from our Lord's Command, againſt the Infants of all Nations, that they are not to be Diſcipl'd and Baptiz'd, becauſe not to be taught; even ſo is your *Shepherd* ſuppos'd to argue from your command againſt the Lambs of your Flock, that they are not to be preſerv'd or driven from off the Starving Commons into a better Paſture, becauſe they are not to be Clipt. For thus, in one Word,

Our Lord's Command is, ſay our Adverſaries, to have all Nations Diſcipl'd, Baptiz'd, and Taught; And therefore None are to be Diſcipl'd and Baptiz'd, but ſuch as are to be Taught too, and conſequently no Infants. And juſt ſo, Your *Shepherd* may be ſuppos'd to ſay, my Maſter's Command is to have all his Flock Preſerv'd, better Paſtur'd, and well Clipt, and therefore none of his Flock are to be preſerv'd and better Paſtur'd, but ſuch as are to be Clipt too, and Conſequently no Lambs.

And thus, This way of Arguing being ſo mightily inſiſted upon by our Adverſaries (this indeed being their great and moſt common Objection) I have therefore taken leave by this very plain and eaſie Compariſon to ſhew you the Vanity and Folly of it.

And I am perſuaded that you will not countenance or juſtifie this way of Arguing, leſt deluded by the like way of Reaſoning, your *Shep-*

Shepherd ſhould really play you the Scurvy trick which I have onely now ſuppos'd.

Again, This way of Arguing may be very injurious to the Poor and Needy likewiſe, as I will here demonſtrate to you by another very plain Caſe.

Suppoſe, Good, Sir, that you in your great Charity, ſhould Command me ſaying, Go, Feed and Cloath all the Poor of the Pariſh, at My Coſt and Charge, Teaching them the Duties of Poor People.

Now according to our Adverſary's way of Arguing, tho' you ſhould thus Command me to Feed and Cloath all the Poor without exception, yet I ought not to Feed or Cloath ſo much as one Poor Child in the whole Pariſh, becauſe Children are not to be taught the Duties of Poor People.

But really, Sir, I ſhould not ſo narrowly interpret your Command, nor ſo much as once doubt but your will was, that the poor Children ſhould all be Fed and Cloath'd as well as their Parents, tho' they could not then be ſo well taught their Duties.

And in ſhort, You, Sir, may try me with the Command if you pleaſe, and I will certainly Feed and Cloath all the Poor of the Pariſh, even the ſmall and great together: Yea, and I will not only Teach all that are then to be Taught the Duties of Poor People, but I

will Teach them in due time to Teach their Children the ſame, and ſo in Effect I ſhall Teach, as well as Feed and Cloath all the Poor of the Pariſh, ſo as to fulfill your Command in the ſeveral parts of it.

And this is ſo very plain that you muſt needs ſee, how the Apoſtles in like manner were to fulfill our Lord's Command, to Diſciple, Baptize, and teach all Nations, juſt as I have now ſhew'd you I ſhould fulfill your Command, To Feed and Cloath, and Teach all the Poor of the Pariſh without any exception, as to Children or Infants.

I will add one very plain Caſe more out of Scripture, which I have already taken notice of upon another Occaſion. 'Tis ſaid *Mat.* 25. 32. *That all Nations ſhall be gathered before the great Judge, at the laſt Day*, and it follows, *That ſome ſhall be ſet on the Right, and ſome on the Left-hand of the Judge*, and that he will ſay to thoſe on his Right-hand *I was an Hungred and ye gave me Meat*, and to thoſe on his Left, *I was an hungred and ye gave me no meat*, &c.

Now becauſe none of this can be ſaid to Infants, muſt I conclude that they are no part of the Nations which ſhall be gathered before the Judge at the laſt Day? Truly with as much Reaſon and Truth may Children be excepted againſt, as not meant by the Nations to be gathered before the Judge, as they can be excepted

againſt

againſt, as not meant by the Nations to be Diſcipl'd and Baptiz'd.

For thus, Our Adverſaries will not have Infants to be meant by the Nations to be Baptiz'd, Becauſe theſe Nations are to be taught too, which Infants cannot be. And ſo it may be argu'd that Infants are not to be meant by the Nations to be gathered before the Judge; Becauſe it muſt be ſaid to theſe Nations, *When I was an Hungred, You gave me Meat, Or ye gave me no Meat*; Which to Infants cannot be ſaid.

But moſt certain it is that Infants are meant by all the Nations to be gathered before the Judge, *Mat.* 25. 32. and why they ſhould not be meant by all the Nations to be Diſcipl'd and Baptiz'd, I muſt ſay again that I can ſee no reaſon.

The Command is plain enough and large enough to reach Infants as well as others, Go, ye, Diſciple all Nations, Baptizing them. For if all Nations are to be Baptiz'd, then are Infants and Children to be Baptiz'd among the reſt, unleſs you can ſhew me that they are here excepted, which I am well aſſur'd you cannot, for, That the following words (*Teaching them to obſerve all things &c.*) are no exception to their being Diſcipl'd and Baptiz'd, I hope that I have abundantly clear'd to you after a very plain and undeniable manner.

And thus, I am Heartily perſwaded that I find *Infant-Baptiſm* here taught by our Saviour, after his Death and Reſurrection, before he

Aſcended into Heaven. *Go ye, Diſciple all Nations* (Infants not excepted) *Baptizing them in the Name of the Father*, &c. But then,

At the ſame time, between his Reſurrection and Aſcenſion, we find that he alſo Commanded his Apoſtles, *to go into all the World, and to Preach the Goſpel to every Creature. He that Believeth and is Baptized ſhall be ſaved; but he that Believeth not ſhall be Damned*, Mark 16. 15, 16.

And here, Sir, we have another very terrible Objection to be Anſwer'd, for from theſe words, *He who believeth and is Baptized*, our Adverſaries are very Hot and Noiſy in their Aſſertion, *That none but Believers are to be Baptized*, and therefore no *Infants*. But to this I Anſwer,

Firſt, That *Infants* either have Faith according to the Senſe of this Text, or they have not; if they have ſuch Faith, then they may be Baptized, as our Adverſaries themſelves will grant: But if they have not Faith according to the meaning of this Text, what ſhall I ſay then? E'en the Lord have Mercy upon them, that they may not Die in that Faithleſs *Infant-ſtate*, for the Text ſays poſitively, *That he who Believeth not ſhall be Damned.*

Nothing can be plainer than that this Text ſpeaks of Faith, in ſuch a ſenſe as makes the want of it Damning; but that *Infants* want Faith, ſo as to be Damned for the want of it, *May my Tongue cleave to the Roof of my Mouth, rather than ſay ſo.*

Se-

Secondly, It might truly be ſaid, that *he who Repenteth and Believeth ſhall be ſaved*, and yet it wou'd not thence follow, that Men ought firſt to Repent before they Believe, for that is impoſſible to be done: 'Tis Impoſſible that any Man ſhould Repent and turn unto God, but he muſt firſt believe that there is a God.

And thus, As it could not be true, *That Men ought firſt to Repent, and then to Believe*, tho' it ſhould be ſaid, *That he who Repenteth and Believeth ſhall be ſaved*; So neither is it neceſſarily true, *That we ought firſt to Believe, and then to be Baptized*; becauſe it is ſaid, *That he who Believeth and is Baptized, ſhall be ſaved.*

Thirdly, I dare ſay, That he who ſerveth God faithfully all the days of his Life, and is Baptized, ſhall be ſaved.

But what then? You will not I hope from hence Conclude, That none are to be Baptized till they have ſerved God faithfully all the days of their Lives, or till they are juſt a Dying. Even ſo, when it is ſaid, *He who believeth and is Baptized ſhall be ſaved*, you ought not from hence to Conclude, that none are to be Baptized, till they have Believed.

'Tis indeed the very ſame Caſe. If none but Believers are to be Baptized, becauſe it is ſaid, *He who believeth and is Baptized ſhall be ſaved*; Then none but dying Perſons are to be Baptized, becauſe it may as truly be ſaid, *That he who*

who ſerveth God truly all the days of his whole Life, and is Baptized, ſhall be ſaved.

Laſtly, Tho' you and I were Baptized in our Infancy, yet at the day of Judgment, that great day of Salvation, when the Judge ſhall ask what we have done to be ſaved? I doubt not, Dear Sir, but we may then chearfully Anſwer, that we have Believed and were Baptized. And aſſure your ſelf, that the Merciful Judge will not then reply; But did you firſt Believe, before you were Baptized? For, Good Sir, there is no ſuch Condition of Salvation in the whole Bible. It is not written in Scripture, *That except you Believe, you ſhall not be Baptized*; *or he who believeth not, ſhall not be Baptized*; *or let a Man firſt Believe, and then let him be Baptized.* No, there are no ſuch Texts.

Indeed, there is a Text which ſays, *Except ye become as little Children, ye cannot enter into the (Church, or) Kingdom of God*; But it is no where ſaid, *That little Children muſt firſt become Men, before they ſhall enter into the* (*Church, or*) *Kingdom of God.*

And now Sir, I preſume that I may have your good leave to Conclude for this time.

Having ſufficiently Conſider'd the Texts, wherein we find all that our Saviour Taught from his Reſurrection to his Aſcenſion, concerning *Baptizing* with *Water*; and I am perſwaded that in the two Texts put together, there is

not

not one Syllable againſt *Infant-Baptiſm*, but clear Proof for it in the firſt Text: yea, and the ſecond Text does ſo far plead for the *Baptizing* of *Infants*, as it makes *Baptiſm* generally Neceſſary, in order to Salvation. *He who Believeth and is Baptized, ſhall be ſaved.*

And now in the Third and Laſt Place; I am further to enquire, whether *Infant-Baptiſm* was taught or Commanded by the Apoſtles of our Lord after his Aſcenſion into Heaven.

But this ſhall be my buſineſs in one Letter more, which I deſign upon this Subject, and which you may expect by the next return of this Bearer from,

Sir,

July 15. 1698.

Your &c.

T. H.

LET-

LETTER VIII.

SIR,

I Am now to enquire in the Third and Laſt Place, whether *Infant-Baptiſm* was taught or Commanded by the Apoſtles of our Lord after his Aſcenſion into Heaven.

And here the very firſt time that they taught and practiſed *Baptiſm*, what great Reaſon we have to believe that they then practiſed *Infant-Baptiſm*, I have formerly ſhew'd you, and now again, by the good help of God, I will endeavour ſtill farther to ſhew you, that *Infant-Baptiſm* was taught and Commanded by them, at the ſame time likewiſe. See *Acts* 2. 38.

Repent and be Baptized every one of you, ſaid St. *Peter* there, to ſuch an Aſſembly as can never be ſuppoſed to have been without *Children*; for it was a Throng which was occaſion'd by a ſudden Report of a very wonderful and ſurprizing thing. "'Twas ſuch a mixt Crowd as is wont to flock to-"gether when a Fire happens, or any Fray is "Fought, or Game is Play'd, or Show is Seen; as Mr. *Walker* has repreſented that ſudden Aſſembly.

And this indeed is not much or very heartily deny'd: But our Adverſaries Object and ſay, That

That tho' St. *Peter* ſpoke to ſuch an Aſſembly, and bid them be *Baptized* every one of them, yet He cannot be ſuppoſed to have ſpoken to the *Infant-part* of the Aſſembly, becauſe he bid them firſt Repent. *Repent and be Baptized, every one of you.* To which I might Anſwer,

Firſt, That he may very well be ſuppoſed to have ſpoken to *Infants* and *Children*, even when he ſaid *Repent*; for I find in Scripture that *Children* have been concern'd in the Exerciſes of *Repentance*, as in that great Faſt-day proclaim'd by *Jehoſaphat*, When *all Judah gather'd themſelves together to ask help of the Lord*, you may meet with *their little Ones, and their Children* among the reſt, 2 Chron. 20. 13. Yea, and when the Prophet *Joel* Exhorted to a general *Repentance*, even to *Sanctifie a Faſt, and to call a Solemn Aſſembly*; he not only directed that the *Elders* ſhould be *Aſſembled*, but even that *Children and ſuch as ſuck'd the Breaſt* ſhould be ſo too, *Joel.* 2. 16. But,

Secondly, Tho' it was true, that Children could not be concern'd in St. *Peter*'s Exhortation to *Repent*, yet this would be no juſt Cauſe or Impediment why they might not be concern'd in the following Words, *Be Baptized every one of you.*

For pray, Dear Sir, Had the Apoſtle then ſaid, *Sell your Eſtates and give to the Poor, and be Baptized every one of you*; Would you from thence have concluded, that none but Landed Men ought to have been *Baptized*; none but ſuch

as

as had Eſtates to ſell? or would the Poor Man have been excluded from *Baptiſm*, for want of Lands and Tenements to diſpoſe of? No certainly. But had the Apoſtle ſo ſaid, *Sell your Eſtates and give to the Poor, and be Baptized every one of you:* he could only have meant, that the Rich Men ſhould Sell their Eſtates and give to the Poor, but that they ſhould be Baptized every one of them, Rich and Poor together, and as well they who had no Eſtates, as they who had.

And juſt ſo, When he ſaid, *Repent and be Baptized every one of you*, he could only mean, that they ſhould firſt Repent who ſtood in need of Repentance; but that they ſhould be Baptized every one of them, not only the Penitent, but they who needed not Repentance likewiſe.

Or ſuppoſe again, that the Apoſtle had ſaid, *Forgive your Enemies and be Baptized every one of you*, What think you, Sir, might not the happy Men who had no Enemies have been Baptized, becauſe they could not firſt forgive their Enemies? Yes ſurely, tho' they could forgive no Enemies, who had no Enemies to be forgiven by them; yet nevertheleſs they might have been Baptized as well as they, who having Enemies did firſt forgive them.

For upon this ſuppoſition, that the Apoſtle had really ſaid, *Forgive your Enemies and be Baptized every one of you*, he could only have meant that

that Perſons qualified for Baptiſm ought not to be in a ſtate of Enmity; and hence it wou'd have follow'd that they who were not at Enmity with any, were the very Perſons ſo qualify'd and fit to be Baptiz'd, without any more ado. But they who were in a State of Enmity, they indeed were firſt to get out of that State by forgiving their Enemies, before they could be fit for Baptiſm.

And thus, as he has ſaid, *Repent and be Baptized every one of you*; he can only mean that Perſons qualifi'd for Baptiſm ought not to be in an impenitent State. And hence it follows, that they who are not in an Impenitent State (as Children are not) are the very Perſons qualify'd and fit for Baptiſm without any more ado; but they who are in an Impenitent State, they indeed are firſt to get out of that State by Repenting, before they can be fit for Baptiſm.

And now, Good Sir, excuſe the Repetition, whilſt I briefly ſet theſe things together.

Suppoſe St. *Peter* had ſaid, ſell your Eſtates and be Baptiz'd every one of you, he muſt needs have meant that all ſhould be Baptiz'd, as well they who had no Eſtates as they who had, and only that they who had Eſtates ſhould firſt be obliged to ſell them. Or,

Suppoſe he had ſaid, forgive your Enemies and be Baptiz'd every one of you, he muſt needs

needs have been underſtood as exhorting them all to be Baptiz'd; as well them who had no Enemies, as them who had, and only that they who had Enemies ſhould firſt be oblig'd to forgive them.

And ſo, As he has ſaid, *Repent and be Baptiz'd every one of you*, he muſt needs mean that every one of them ſhould be Baptiz'd, as well the happy Part of the Company who needed no Repentance, as the Part that did; and only that they who needed Repentance ſhould firſt be oblig'd to Repent. And accordingly our Bleſſed Lord and Saviour himſelf, who needed no Repentance, and therefore did not firſt Repent, was yet Baptiz'd, as well as they who did firſt Repent, becauſe they needed Repentance.

And thus, the way ſo far thus clear'd, I will now venture on to the Promiſe annext to this Exhortation of St. *Peter*, whereby it will ſtill more evidently appear that he has here taught the Baptiſm of Children.

For to perſwade them to be Baptiz'd every one of them, *Be Baptiz'd*, ſaid he, *and ye ſhall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt*; and leaſt they ſhould miſtake him as not meaning their Children together with themſelves, he expreſsly adds, *For the Promiſe is to you and to your Children.*

The Promiſe was the ſame to them and to their Children, and they were to receive it by the

the ſame means, *viz.* by *Baptiſm*; for if the promiſe might have been receiv'd without *Baptiſm*, in vain did the Apoſtles urge it as an argument to perſwade them to be *Baptiz'd.*

So that 'tis very plain that *Baptiſm* was the Means whereby the promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt was to be receiv'd, and therefore as their Children were to receive it as well as themſelves, it follows, that their Children as well as themſelves were to be *Baptiz'd*, that they might receive it. And ſo ſays the Apoſtle, *Be baptiz'd every one of you, and ye ſhall receive, &c.*

But here perhaps you may be ready to ask, whether *Baptiſm* be neceſſary to our Receiving the Holy Ghoſt, or whether none elſe do receive it but they who are Baptiz'd.

To which I anſwer that Baptiſm is as neceſſary to our receiving the Holy Ghoſt, as a diligent Hand is neceſſary to make one Rich. *The Diligent hand maketh Rich*, ſays *Solomon.*

And therefore as Riches do ſometimes indeed by God's over-ruling Providence fall to the ſhare, even of the Lazy and the Slothful, So by God's extraordinary Mercy is the Holy Ghoſt ſometimes indeed given, even to the *Unbaptiz'd.* But what then? ſhall a Man hope to be Rich without Diligence, becauſe the Lazy are ſometimes ſo? In like manner, ſhall any one hope for the Spirit without *Baptiſm*, becauſe the Unbaptiz'd do ſometimes receive it?

It would not be wiſely argued ſhould a Man thus diſpute; *Solomon* tells us indeed *that a Diligent hand maketh Rich*, well and it may be ſo, but let them be ty'd up to his Rule that will; for my part I ſhall hold my ſelf excus'd, hoping that Riches may be had in an eaſier way, even as I ſometimes ſee the Slothful have them.

And yet juſt ſuch is his Argument who thus diſputes. 'Tis the Apoſtles rule indeed, *Be baptiz'd and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt*; well and it may be ſo, but let them be ty'd up to his Rule that will; for my part I ſhall hold my ſelf excus'd, hoping for the Holy Spirit without any ſuch Condition, even as I ſometimes ſee that the Unbaptized receive it.

But ſtill further: 'Tis objected on the other hand, that if the promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt was ſo annext to *Baptiſm*; methinks we ſhould ſee more and better Fruits of it in thoſe that are *Baptiz'd*.

To which I anſwer, That tho' it be very true that a diligent Hand maketh Rich, yet it is not every diligent Man that becomes Rich, for want of a good Uſe and wiſe Improvement, of what his diligent hand acquires and gives him a juſt Title to. So tho' *Baptiſm* has the promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt made to it, yet the *Baptiz'd* do not all bring forth the Fruits of the Spirit, for want of a good Uſe of that Spiritual

grace

grace and Influence, which their *Baptiſm* acquires, and gives them a Right and Title to.

But tho' the Diligent do not all become Rich for the aforeſaid Reaſon, yet Diligence is ſtill to be Exhorted to, as a great and neceſſary means of becoming Rich; and ſo, tho' the Baptized do not all bring forth the fruits of the Spirit, for the like Reaſon aforeſaid, yet Baptiſm is ſtill to be Exhorted to, as a great and neceſſary means of receiving the Spirit: *Be baptized*, ſays St. *Peter, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.*

And this indeed ſeems to have been the great and ſtanding Argument of this Apoſtle; It was his uſual way to Argue from the Inward part of this Sacrament to the Outward. For,

When the Holy Ghoſt fell upon *Cornelius* and them that were with him, *Can any Man forbid Water*, ſaid our Apoſtle, *that theſe ſhould not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghoſt as well as we?* Act. 10. 47. So here in this Text, *The promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt*, ſays he, *is to you and to your Children, and therefore be Baptized every one of you that you may receive it.*

But Sir, Here is one Difficulty more to be Encounter'd ſtill, for here it is that our Adverſaries have ſtarted an Objection, to which they Boaſtingly ſay, that we can give them no Anſwer; but truly, Sir, the Reaſon is, becauſe they will receive no Anſwer, and we cannot help that.

And therefore to deal fairly both with you and them, you ſhall firſt hear their Objection in its full force, and then our Anſwer, and you ſhall Judge between us.

Their Objection is this, *That Children are not capable of Receiving the Holy Ghoſt, and that therefore 'tis all folly to Baptize them upon that account.* And farther, St. *Peter*'s ſaying to that great Aſſembly, *Act.* 2. 38. *Be baptized every one of you, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt*, makes it very plain that he Exhorted none to be Baptized but ſuch as were capable of receiving the Holy Ghoſt; but of this the little *Children* were not Capable, and therefore were not to be Baptized.

This, Sir, is their mighty Objection, and I am pretty Confident they will acknowledge that I have not minc'd the matter, but have ſet it before you with all its ſtrength.

And now then, to give a ſatisfactory Anſwer to it: I ſhall make it my buſineſs to prove to you that even *Infants* and *Children* are capable of receiving the Holy Ghoſt, and this I ſhall endeavour to do with all the plainneſs, and brevity, and cloſeneſs that I can. And therefore,

Firſt, we hear it very often from our Adverſaries in a Challenging and Triumphant way, that if we could but ſhew in all the *New Teſtament* any one *Infant* to have been Baptized, they would no longer diſpute that Caſe with us.

But

But, Sir, we can ſhew them an *Infant* in the *Old Teſtament*; yea, and an *Infant* in the *New Teſtament* too, that receiv'd the Holy Ghoſt: And why then will they diſpute this any longer?

We know that it is the Holy Ghoſt that Sanctifies us, and yet we read in the *Old Teſtament* that the Prophet *Jeremy was Sanctified even before he came out of the Womb*, Jer. 1. 5. And if we will take an Angel's word for it, we are aſſur'd, in the *New Teſtament*, that *John the Baptiſt was filled with the Holy Ghoſt even from his Mother's Womb*, Luke 1. 15.

And here I will add, what I before obſerv'd, of the little *Children* who were brought unto Chriſt, and whom he took up in his Arms, *viz. That he bleſſed them with Spiritual Bleſſings*, and therefore 'tis evident that even theſe little *Children* did then receive the Holy Spirit; for we muſt mean nothing elſe by receiving the Holy Ghoſt or Holy Spirit, but receiving the Graces and Bleſſings of the Holy Spirit.

Secondly, The Holy *Job* has moſt truly taught us, That *a Clean thing is not to be brought out of an Unclean*, Job 14. 4. No, but all are conceived and born in Sin, as well as he who ſaid, *Behold I was ſhapen in Iniquity, and in Sin did my Mother conceive me*, Pſal. 51. 5. But then if all our *Children* are ſo conceived and born, and cannot be brought *clean out of an unclean thing*, I

am ready to tremble at the thought, what would become of them if they were not capable of ſome Spiritual Cleanſing! certainly, Dear Sir, they are, or elſe 'tis moſt certain that *no unclean thing can enter into the Kingdom of God.*

Again, Our Lord has told us, That *that which is born of the Fleſh is Fleſh*, (ſinful Fleſh of ſinful Fleſh) *John* 3. 6. and there he alſo teaches us, that what is only ſo born cannot ſee the Kingdom of God, for ſays he (ἐὰν μή τις) *except one be born again*, that is, *born again of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot ſee the Kingdom of God.* And this therefore would be another hard ſaying for our Children, if they were not capable of being born again of the Spirit.

And further, If Children are Holy, they muſt be made ſo by the Holy Ghoſt; For it is that Holy Spirit which *Sanctifies* or makes *Holy*, and therefore muſt the *Children* needs be ſo *Sanctified* who are ſaid to be *Holy*, 1 Cor. 7. 14. And indeed, unleſs they are ſo, tho' their Angels may behold the Face of God; yet how ſhall they themſelves ever come to ſee that Bleſſed Sight? Since we are expreſly told, *that without Holineſs no one* (οὐδεὶς is the Original word, and ſignifies no one, be it who it will, Man or Child, *Without Holineſs no one*) *ſhall ſee the Lord*, Heb. 12. 14.

Thirdly, Dr. *Fuller* has obſerved, "That the "great cauſe of Men's miſtakes in this matter "is

" is this, They make the Body the Standard of " the Soul, and are apt to think that the Soul " grows bigger as the Body does; even as if our " Souls were very little things when we are *In-* " *fants*, in compariſon of what they are when " we become Men: Which is a very groſs miſtake indeed; for our Souls are not capable of any ſuch growth, but as to that, are the very ſame when firſt infuſed into our Bodies, that they are ever after; the ſame in our Infancy, that they are in our Old Age; and therefore why our Souls, which as to their Subſtance are the ſame in every period of our Life, why they ſhould at any time be incapable of receiving the Holy Ghoſt, or of being Sanctified thereby, Let them give you a Reaſon, who can find out a Reaſon to give, for I can find none.

But ſome there are, who will not yet believe the Spirit of Sanctification to be in *Infants*; no, not in Baptized *Infants*, becauſe they can ſee no Sign or Expreſſion of it.

To which I farther Anſwer, with the admir'd Biſhop *Taylor*, " That it is no good Argument " to ſay, *Here is no Seed in the bowels of the Earth, becauſe there is nothing green upon the face of it.* Nor is it a good Argument to ſay, *That an Heir ſo long as he is a Child, is no Heir, becauſe ſo long as he is a Child he differeth nothing from a Servant, or we ſee no ſign of his being Heir, and Lord of all*; as the Apoſtle ſpeaks.

Nay, and further, When a Branch is Engrafted into the good *Olive-Tree*, it receives from it a kind of new Life and Nouriſhment, tho' we do not immediately ſee any fruits of its doing ſo. Even ſo when *Infants* are grafted into Chriſt by *Baptiſm*, and made Members of that *True Vine* (as he calls himſelf, *John* 15. 1.) they are thereby made Partakers of a new Spiritual Life and Nouriſhment; tho' we do not preſently ſee the good fruits of their being ſo.

Again, Chriſt's Body is his Church, and the Soul of that Body is the Holy Spirit; and when *Infants* are *Baptized* and *Incorporated* into that Body, they are thereby put under the Communications and Influences of the Spirit, as every the leaſt Part or Cubit added to our Statures, is thereby put under the Influences of our Souls.

For thus, "*Baptiſm*, ſays Dr. *Sherlock*, is our "Regeneration or New Birth, the Begin-"nings of a New Life, becauſe it Incorporates "us into Chriſt's Myſtical Body, which puts "us under the Influences and Communications "of his Life and Spirit; as when a Branch is En-"grafted into a Stock, it receives nouriſhment "and life from it. *Diſcourſe concerning the Nature of Unity*, &c. p. 24.

And ſays Dr. *Scott* (another of your juſtly Admired Authors) "It is by his Bleſſed Spirit that "Chriſt hath promiſed to be with us to the end "of the World, *Mat.* 28. 20. And Chriſt him-

"ſelf

" ſelf hath aſſur'd us that upon his Aſcenſion into " Heaven, *He would pray his Father, and he ſhould* " *give us another Comforter*, meaning this Holy " Ghoſt, *that he might abide with us for ever*, Joh. " 14. 16. And accordingly the Holy Ghoſt is vi- " tally united to the Church of Chriſt, even as " Souls are united to their Bodies; *For as there* " *is one Body or Church, ſo there is one Spirit* " *which animates that Body*, Eph. 4. 4. So that " when by *Baptiſm* we are once Incorporated in- " to this Body, we are Entituled to, and do at " leaſt, *de Jure*, participate of the vital Influence " of the Holy Ghoſt, who is the Soul of it. *Chri- ſtian Life*, Part 2. Vol. 2. Chap. 7. p. 76, 77.

Indeed we know not how every particle of Fleſh that grows to our Bodies is immediately enliven'd by our Souls, and yet ſo it is: And juſt ſo, tho' we know not how, every Mem- ber that's added to the Body of Chriſt, is quick- ned by that Holy Spirit, which, as the Soul of that Body, Communicates all its Spiritual Life to it.

And, *Laſtly*, That the Holy Spirit may be where we ſee no ſigns or expreſſions of it, is plainly taught by our Saviour himſelf, *The wind bloweth where it liſteth, and thou heareſt the ſound thereof, but canſt not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth; ſo is every one that is born of the Spirit*, John 3. 8. And ſo is every *Infant* that is born of the Spirit: The Spirit comes upon it though

though thou canſt not tell how nor whence.

And all this I hope is very ſufficient Proof, that even *Infants* and *Children* are capable of receiving the Holy Spirit, and then according to St. *Peter*'s Argument, *who can forbid Water that they ſhould not be Baptized, who can receive the Holy Ghoſt as well as we*? Act. 10 47.

And in ſhort, Our Adverſaries great Objection is this, when St. *Peter* ſaid, *Be baptized every one of you, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt*; he plainly taught that none are to be Baptized, but ſuch as are capable of receiving the Holy Ghoſt. But of this (ſay they) little *Children* are not capable, and therefore are not to be *Baptized.*

To which I will now Anſwer, That when St. *Peter* ſaid, *Be Baptized every one of you, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt*; he plainly taught, that all are to be Baptized who are capable of receiving the Holy Ghoſt: But of this I have now prov'd little *Children* to be capable, and therefore they are to be *Baptized.*

And thus I am perſwaded that the *Baptiſm* of *Children* is moſt certainly taught by St. *Peter*, in this very Text, *Repent and be Baptized every one of you for the Remiſſion of Sins, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt, for the Promiſe is to you and to your Children.* The plain ſenſe of which Text is this, *The promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt is to you and to your Children*, and there-

therefore be *Baptized* every one of you, you and your Children, that you may receive it.

And thus I have finiſhed the Task which you ſet me, and I hope you need not be remember'd that I have thus far been Anſwering your Grand Objection, *That you no where find in Scripture, either that any Infants were Baptized, or Commanded to be Baptized.* And therefore it muſt be conſider'd, that I could not fairly inſiſt upon any other Arguments in the Defence of the poor *Childrens* Right to *Baptiſm*, but ſuch as fell in the way, wherein your Objection has been my Guide to lead me; and yet I have ſome hopes that notwithſtanding our Adverſaries great pretences to Scripture, I have ſaid enough to ſatisfie you, that there is not one Syllable in the Texts which they alledge againſt *Infant-Baptiſm*, but a great deal for it.

But, now then, Sir, I ſhould hugely wrong the Cauſe, ſhould I not here admoniſh you that there are Twenty and Twenty more Arguments ſtill for the *Baptiſm* of *Infants*, which I have not ſo much as once touch'd or hinted at; for they came not within the Compaſs of my undertaking: So that if you'd be furniſh'd with all the Plentiful variety of Arguments in this Caſe, you muſt conſult the many excellent Writers upon this Subject, and particularly thoſe very Learned Authors mention'd in my Fourth *Letter*. I am not willing to take their Arguments

guments out of their hands, for I am not so vain as to think my self able to mend them. And therefore I will here conclude, unless it may please you to lay some further Command upon,

Sir,

July 22. 1698. *Your real and humble Servant,*

T. H.

LETTER IX.

SIR,

I Am very willing to take that One step more which you speak of, and at your request to set before you, so far as I am able, a true Notion of *Baptism* as to the Necessity of it, (which as you truly imagine) may give considerable Light to some difficulties relating to this Sacrament.

And here I will lay down this as a Fundamental Rule; Namely, *That when we have done all, we are unprofitable Servants*, we can never merit at the hands of God the least of all his Mercies; but from whence then are all our hopes of his greatest, but from his own gracious promises? Well:

Well: But 'tis every where plain in Scripture that all his Promiſes are Conditional, made to us by way of Covenant or Contract, upon Condition that we do ſo and ſo, as he commands and requires us to do in his Holy Word

And thus the *New Teſtement*, which teaches us our whole Chriſtian Duty, is called in the Original, Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη, the *New Covenant*; that is, 'Tis the Writing which contains the Sum of all God's Promiſes to us, and of our Engagements to him, which we are obliged to perform that we may obtain thoſe Promiſes: And ſo his Promiſes on the one hand, and our Engagements on the other, make up that *New Covenant* which is the Sum and Subſtance of our Chriſtian Religion.

And 'tis this *New Covenant* which gives us our great hopes of Salvation, of Heaven, and Eternal Happineſs; For tho' we can do nothing to *Merit* or *Deſerve* ſuch infinite Bleſſings, yet as God has been pleaſed to Promiſe them upon ſuch and ſuch Conditions, our performance of theſe Conditions may give us a good Claim and Title to them.

For thus, Sir, ſhould you Contract and Covenant with me, to let me have and hold your Eſtate upon this Condition, That I ſhall yearly Pay you for it one Pepper-Corn, tho' ſuch a Payment would come vaſtly ſhort of the worth of your Eſtate, yet by Virtue of the ſaid Contract

tract and Covenant, it would give me a juſt Claim and Title to it.

In like manner, God contracts and covenants with us to give us Heaven and Happineſs, upon the Terms of our Faith and Repentance; and ſo tho' our Faith and Repentance come infinitely more ſhort of the worth of Heaven and Happineſs, than a Pepper-corn does of your Eſtate, yet by Virtue of the Covenant which God makes with us, to give us Heaven and Happineſs upon theſe conditions of Faith and Repentance, Our performance of theſe Conditions gives us a good title to all That Heaven and Happineſs, which are ſo graciouſly promis'd to us upon theſe Terms.

In ſhort we cannot by our Faith and Repentance deſerve and merit Salvation, no more than I could pretend to merit your Eſtate by paying a *Pepper-Corn* for it: No; but as all the title which my Punctual payment of a *Pepper-Corn* could give me to your Eſtate would be but a Covenant-Title; ſo 'tis no other but a-like Covenant-Title which our Faith and Repentance give us to Salvation; that is to ſay, they entitle us to Salvation only as they are the Terms and Conditions upon which God, in the *New Covenant*, has promiſed to ſave us.

And now, Sir, You very well know that no Covenant is of any force or Binding, till it

is

is firſt ſign'd and Seal'd, till that Solemnity be firſt over we have no legal Title to the things Covenanted for; No, but be the contract never ſo advantageous, it muſt be firſt Seal'd and Sign'd, before we can claim the Benefit of it.

And thus has it pleas'd God after the manner of Men to ratifie his Covenants with Mankind (as it were) with Sign and Seal, *for ſo was Circumciſion a Sign whereby the Covenant between God and the Jews was Seal'd and Confirm'd*, *Rom.* 4. 11. and till the Covenant was ſo Sign'd and Seal'd, it was of no force; there was no benefit to be claim'd by it, No, but the uncircumcis'd Man-Child was to be cut off from God's People, that is, *He was not to be reckon'd with thoſe People who were in Covenant with God*, Gen. 17. 14

And as Circumciſion was Then, So is Baptiſm Now, *viz.* A Viſible Sign whereby the New Covenant between God and Us, is Seal'd and Confirm'd; and conſequently till we are firſt Baptiz'd, we are no more in Covenant with God, than was the Uncircumcis'd Man-Child.

And now, Sir, I hope you ſee the Neceſſity of Baptiſm, as it is the Sign and Seal of that New Covenant which gives us all our hopes of *Salvation*. For,

As *Faith* and *Repentance* are neceſſary to our *Salvation*, as the Conditions of the New Covenant,

nant; So is Baptiſm neceſſary, as the Sign and Seal of that Covenant, to make it of force, and to give us a legal claim to the Bleſſings promiſed on God's part, upon our performance of the Conditions promiſed on ours.

And thus it is, that to obtain Remiſſion of Sins and Salvation, we are exhorted in the New Teſtament, as well to Seal the Covenant by being Baptized, as to perform the Conditions of it, by Believing and Repenting, for ſo, *He who Believeth and is Baptized ſhall be ſaved*, ſays our Saviour, *Mark*, 16. 16. *And repent and be Baptized for the remiſſion of Sins*, ſays St. *Peter*, *Acts* 2. 38.

But it may be ask'd; Will not the Conditions ſave us without the Seal? Or will not Faith and Repentance ſave us without *Baptiſm*.

To which I anſwer, Firſt, That in ſome extraordinary Caſe, the want of *Baptiſm*, (as the want of *Circumciſion* was in the *Wilderneſs*) may be diſpens'd with, when by reaſon of Impoſſibilities or inſufferable Inconveniences, the hearty deſire and will to be *Baptized* may be accepted of for the Deed.

And becauſe I would not be miſunderſtood, I will here take leave to clear to you my meaning after this plain manner.

Should a Gracious Prince covenant with his People to give them large Poſſeſſions, great Freedoms and Privileges upon ſome very eaſie Con-

Conditions, which he might therefore require that they ſhould be ſeverally oblig'd to the performance of under their own Hands and Seals.

Now ſhould any of his Subjects be any ways hindred from Setting their Hands and Seals to ſuch an advantageous Covenant, tho' they very much deſir'd and endeavour'd ſo to do; I cannot think but a gracious Prince would in ſuch a Caſe excuſe and diſpenſe with their not Sealing, and would by no means deprive them of the benefits of the Covenant for an unwilling Omiſſion which they could no ways help.

But then, ſhould any of them refuſe to ſet their Hands and Seals to the *Covenant* out of meer Wilfulneſs and Stubbornneſs, this ſure would be interpreted to be perfect contempt, and a down-right rejecting of the Covenant it ſelf; and it is not to be imagin'd that the moſt gracious Prince in the World would beſtow the benefits of ſuch a Covenant upon ſuch wretched Deſpiſers of it.

And this is our Caſe; The moſt Gracious King of Heaven covenants to give us all the Richeſt Bleſſings both of this World and the next, upon very eaſie Conditions; which he therefore requires that we ſhould be oblig'd to the performance of by our Baptiſmal Engagements.

But now, when it ſo happens that Baptiſm is not to be had, tho' it be never ſo much deſir'd or ſought for, I doubt not but our gracious God will hold us excus'd in ſuch a Caſe; nor will he deprive us of the Benefits of the

New Covenant, for want of that Baptiſm (which is the Seal of it) when we can no ways have it.

But then, ſhould we Willfully and Stubbornly refuſe ſo to Seal, or to come under any Baptiſmal Engagements; This certainly wou'd be look'd upon as holding the Covenant it ſelf in deſpight, nor cou'd it be expected that our Gracious God, ſhou'd beſtow the benefits of ſuch an advantageous Covenant upon them, who ſhou'd ſo dare to deſpiſe it.

And therefore, *Secondly*, They who are ſo Confident that Faith and Repentance will ordinarily and always ſave us without Baptiſm: They ſeem to me either to have too high thoughts of their Faith and Repentance, or too low thoughts of Salvation.

'Tis indeed a popular Argument to ſay, that ſure God will never deny Salvation to a poor penitent Believer, tho' he ſhou'd refuſe to be Baptized. But Sir, I may as well ſay, that ſure you will not deny your Eſtate to any One who ſhall yearly pay you a Pepper-corn for it, tho' he refuſe to Seal any Contract to that purpoſe.

For, as a Pepper-corn, without a Contract, or by it's own pure worth and merit can never be thought a valuable Conſideration for your Eſtate, ſo Faith and Repentance without a Covenant, or by their own pure worth and merit can never be ſufficient to purchaſe our Salvation. For pray, Dear Sir, what is our Faith and Repentance worth in compariſon with Salvation?

vation? Truly not so much (as I said before) as a Pepper-Corn is worth in comparison with your Estate.

And therefore, as it is necessary that there should be a Contract to that purpose, and that That Contract should be first Seal'd, before your Estate can be laid claim to upon the poor Terms of paying a Pepper-Corn for it; so it is necessary, that there be a Covenant to That purpose, and that That Covenant be first Seal'd before Salvation can be laid claim to upon the poor Conditions of our Faith and Repentance.

And yet 'tis true, I do not for all this, absolutely deny Salvation to a good Man, for being Unbaptized, even when he might have been so; for God's Mercies are Infinite, and he may do more than he has promis'd, and save even them, whom he is not oblig'd by any Covenant to save. Just, Good Sir, as you may dispose of your Estate to whom you please, tho' you be under no obligation of promise or covenant so to do. But who can wisely or with any good assurance expect this at your Hands? Such an uncontracted, uncovenanted bounty is more than can be reasonably hop'd for.

And certainly 'tis much a wiser Course to secure to our selves an Inheritance by a Covenant-right and Title to it, than to depend for it upon any Man's unknown Will and Pleasure. And so 'tis certainly much safer to have a Covenant-title to the Kingdom of Heaven, than wholly

to rely upon an uncertain extraordinary kindneſs, and to depend for it upon God's unknown and uncovenanted Mercies.

In ſhort, the Summ of what I have now ſaid is this; God will in ſome Caſes ſave us without Baptiſm; *viz.* when Baptiſm is not to be had tho' it be deſir'd and ſought for; Yea, and for ought we know to the contrary, by his extraordinary uncovenanted Mercies he may ſave ſome who might be baptized but are not. But this is a great Uncertainty, ſuch an Uncertainty as no wiſe Man will rely upon, or venture his Salvation upon ſuch a perillous hazard; nay, but without the Covenant it would be Pride and Preſumption in the beſt Man upon Earth to pretend to an ASSURANCE of Salvation, or to claim any Right to be ſaved, meerly upon the account of his own worthleſs Performances.

But then, on the other hand, when the New Covenant has been ſeal'd in Baptiſm, God is even then oblig'd to fulfil his Promiſes made in that Covenant to them who perform the Conditions of it: And as he is faithful in all his Promiſes, and juſt in all his Dealings, he cannot, will not do otherwiſe. No, but tho' our beſt Performances come infinitely ſhort of Salvation in Worth and Merit; Yet as God has covenanted to ſave us upon ſuch worthleſs Conditions, we are hence ASSURED that he will do ſo.

But now, Sir, let me ask, *Firſt*, Who can diſpoſe of your Eſtate upon any Conditions, much leſs

C.

leſs upon very mean Conditions, and ſeal Covenants to ſuch purpoſe in your Name? Who, I ſay, can do thus, unleſs you do your ſelf impower and commiſſion him ſo to do; that is, unleſs it be ſome prime Servant or Steward, whom you have your ſelf firſt Authoriz'd in that behalf?

But then, Who is it that in the Name of God may Contract and Covenant with us to give us his Heaven and Happineſs upon any ſuch worthleſs Conditions as we are Capable of performing? Who, I ſay, dares take this power upon him, unleſs it be given him from above; that is, unleſs he be a Lawful Miniſter of Chriſt, and *a Steward of the Myſteries of God*? 1 *Cor.* 4. 1.

In a word, When we baptize we do in God's ſtead and in his Name Contract and Covenant with the Baptized Perſons, and ſo we take upon us to oblige God himſelf to make good the Promiſes of that Covenant whenſoever the Conditions of it are perform'd. But certainly then, when we take thus much upon us, even to bring God himſelf into Bonds, and under Obligations, it infinitely Concerns us to be throughly ſatisfy'd by what Authority we do this, and who gave us this Authority.

"You muſt needs underſtand this (ſays an "excellent Author) that they who ſhall pre-"tend to act in any Office by the King's Au-"thority without a true Commiſſion; The "King will be ſo far from reckoning himſelf "oblig'd to confirm what they ſhall act in his "Name, that he will puniſh the preſumption

" of ſuch Officers, and thoſe that adhere to " them; and, Dear Sir, I will leave it to you to make the Application.

But then, *Secondly*, Let me ask again, Are there any more *New Covenants* than one? Or are not we and our Children to be ſaved by the ſame *Covenant?* And why then may not our Children together with our ſelves be admitted to a Partnerſhip in it? It was their Ancient Privilege to be admitted with their Parents in to Covenant with God, as you may plainly ſee, (and pray, Sir, take your Bible and look the place) *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12.

And it is no ſtrange thing for Children to be bound in Covenants as Copartners with their Parents, " For may not a Parent (ſays Mr. *Bax-* " *ter*) take a Leaſe for Himſelf and his Child? " Yea (ſays he) it is a plain natural Duty of Pa- " rents to Covenant for their Children, when " it is for their Good. And he asks the Queſti- " on, Were it not a Sin in that Parent who " would refuſe to engage his Child in an ad- " vantageous Covenant, when elſe the Child " would loſe the benefit of it? And ſays our very Learned Biſhop of *Ely* " A Parent may " Contract with God on his Child's behalf, as " a Guardian does in behalf of a *Minor*, or one " under age; which paſſage with more of the ſame Nature is in That his admirable Diſcourſe call'd *Aqua Genitalis.*

And now, Good Sir, That I may clear and con-

conclude this whole matter very briefly, I will only farther ask leave to exercise your Patience with this very plain Case.

Should some great Person make the kind offer, to lease out his Estate to his Tenants and to their Children upon Condition, that they shall be bound (as oft as they shall be required) to do some little Suit and Service to him.

Should you then ask me, What is requir'd of such Persons as are to have these Leases Seal'd to them?

I could answer, That they are to promise and do some little Suit and Service to their Landlord, whensoever they shall be required so to do.

And should you ask again, But why then are Children bound in such Leases, when by reason of their tender Age they can neither promise nor perform that Suit and Service?

Now to this I could likewise answer, Because their Parents or Guardians promise and engage for them, (which is a very usual thing) which Promise and Engagement, when they come to age themselves are bound to perform.

And should you ask again, But how can Parents or Guardians promise truly for their Children, that they shall do such Suit and Service, when perhaps they may not live to do it; or else when they come to age, they may prove Undutiful and Stubborn, and may refuse to do it.

Even to this I could likewise answer, *First*, That if they do not live till they are capable of

performing the Promiſes made for them; then 'tis moſt certain that they do not live till they are capable of Breaking them; and ſo far therefore all's well enough, I hope. And *Secondly*, If when they come at age they prove Stubborn and Diſobedient, and will not be perſwaded to do the Suit and Service which their Parents or Guardians promis'd in their Names; Well, Sir, even in this Caſe of the Childrens diſobedience, their Parents are ſtill blameleſs, nor do their Promiſes made for their Children become Lyes and Falſhoods, as ſome fooliſhly ſpeak, for they were Covenant-promiſes, and all the meaning of them was, that their Children ſhould perform them, or elſe forfeit their Leaſes; So that if their Children do not perform them, they muſt e'en forfeit accordingly, and there's an end of that matter.

And thus, In the New Covenant, whereof Chriſt Jeſus is the Mediator, *Heb.* 8. 6. and which was the purchaſe of his Blood, as is intimated in that ſaying wherein his Blood is called the *Blood of the New Covenant*, that is, the Blood whereby the *New Covenant* was purchas'd *Mat.* 26. 28. In this *New Covenant* I ſay which God, through the Merits and Mediation of Jeſus Chriſt makes with all that will enter into it, He obliges himſelf on the one hand to beſtow Heaven and Happineſs upon the Conditions of Faith and Repentance, and they who enter into this Covenant do on the other hand Promiſe and Engage

gage to perform these Conditions. And now Sir, If you ask, *What is required of Persons to be Baptized into this Covenant?*

You have an Answer in our *Catechism*; *Repentance, whereby they forsake sin; and Faith, whereby they steadfastly believe the Promises of God made to them in that Sacrament.*

And if you ask again, *Why then are Infants Baptiz'd, when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform them?*

The Answer follows in the same *Catechism*, *Because* (as in the aforesaid Case) *they Promise them by their Sureties, which Promise when they come to age themselves are bound to perform.*

And if you ask again, *How can Sureties truly promise for such Infants that they shall perform these Conditions, when perhaps they may not live to perform them; or else if they live to't, they may prove Stubborn and undutiful, and refuse to perform them?*

To which I Answer as before, *First*, That if they do not live to perform, then neither do they live to break them, nor consequently is there any breach of promise thus far to be accounted for. And, *Secondly*, If when they come at Age, they prove Stubborn and Disobedient, and will not be perswaded to perform what their Sureties promised for them: Well Sir, Their Sureties may be still blameless, nor do their promises become Lyes and Falshoods, as some Ignorant Peoples are apt to speak; for it is here to be noted that they are perfect Covenant-promises, and the mean-

meaning of them is, that the Children ſhall perform the Conditions of the Covenant, or elſe forfeit and looſe the Benefits of it.

And thus doubt not, Good Sir, but their Sureties may ſafely Promiſe for our Children, *That they ſhall ſerve God truly all the days of their Lives*, for the Enjoyment of Heaven and Happineſs at the end of them.

And let us not ſay, that we dare not ſo Promiſe for them, leſt they ſhould not perform, and ſo we become Liars; Oh let us not deprive them of the Benefits of the *New Covenant* out of any ſuch vain and fooliſh fear, for thus runs the Covenant whereof *Baptiſm* is the Seal: God promiſes Heaven upon ſuch and ſuch Conditions, and their Sureties promiſe for our Children that they ſhall perform theſe Conditions for that Heaven; that is, they promiſe for our Children that they ſhall perform theſe Conditions, or elſe forfeit that Heaven which is not otherwiſe to be had or hop'd for but upon theſe Conditions.

And this is the true nature and meaning of thoſe Promiſes which are made by Parents and Sureties in the Names of Baptized Infants, and you now plainly ſee, I hope, that there is no ſuch danger in them as ſome poor ſilly people (whom you know and have heard) will be talking of.

And the danger wou'd be leſs ſtill, did but all Sureties ſtrictly obſerve what they are moſt excellently taught in the Exhortation made to them at the Concluſion of the Office for the Publick

lick *Baptism* of *Infants* in our Common Prayer-Books. And indeed,

When you have made an Advantageous Covenant for your Children, as you desire that they should reap the Benefit of it, you must be sure to take care, that (*as soon as they shall be able to learn*) they may be instructed in the Nature of it, and be taught the Conditions required of them; together with the Advantages which will accrue to them by their performance of these Conditions, as also the great Damages which they shall sustain by their wilful neglect of them.

Even so, it is not enough for their Sureties to engage *Infants* and *Children* in Covenant with God, but they must be sure to take care (especially in case of the Parents Death or neglect) *that the Children be taught* (*as soon as they shall be able to learn*) *what they are bound by that Covenant to perform*; and what infinite Gainers they shall certainly be by a Conscientious observance of the Conditions required of them, and what infinite Losers by their wilful and continued failure in the performance of these Conditions.

"Those for whom you stand as Sureties, you "ought (says the Pious Author of the *Christian* "*Monitor*) to do your utmost towards their good "Education in the knowledge of God and Reli-"gion, according to the Charge given you, Es-"pecially if the Parents Die, or prove negligent, *Pag.* 37.

And Dear, Sir, In case of the Parents Death, the

the State has provided that Children ſhall not want Guardians to take care of their Temporal Inheritances, and ſhall any blame the Church for taking as good care of their Souls, as the State has done of their Lands and Poſſeſſions?

Or why may not, why ſhould not the Church require that in caſe of the Parents Death, their Children ſhould have Sureties oblig'd to take care of their Eternal Affairs, as well as the State requires that they ſhall have Guardians oblig'd to take care of their Temporal?

Certainly, were we but as mindful and concern'd what may become of our Childrens Souls after our Deceaſe, as we are concern'd, what may become of the Eſtates which we leave them; we ſhould then be as willing and careful to provide good Sureties for them, who are oblig'd to look after their Souls, as now we are careful to appoint them good Guardians, who are oblig'd to look after their Eſtates.

And, Sir, Let the Ill-adviſed World ſay what they pleaſe, there is as much *Popery* in the State for requiring Guardians, as there is in the Church for requiring Sureties for Children; unleſs the ſame care may not without *Popery* be taken of their Souls, which may without *Popery* be taken of their Eſtates.

But perhaps you will ſay, That Sureties very ſeldom take this care of the Children's Souls, which I am ſpeaking of.

I Anſwer, That neither are all Guardians Faith-

Faithful and Juſt as they ought to be; ſo that you cannot ſtill blame the Church for requiring Sureties, becauſe of that general neglect of their Duties which you obſerve among them; but you muſt alſo blame the State for requiring Guardians, becauſe of that too general unfaithfulneſs, which among them likewiſe is both obſerv'd and lamented in this Age.

And then again, in caſe of the Parents negligence. As it is at the Requeſt of thoſe Parents that we become Sureties for their *Children*, we do thereby acquire ſome kind of Authority over thoſe very Parents themſelves, as well as over their Children; and we may roundly reprove even thoſe very Parents, if they bring not up their Children in the Practice of thoſe Chriſtian Duties, which themſelves deſired and procured us to Promiſe in their Children's Names; and much more may we Reprove and Rebuke their *Children* being grown to years of diſcretion if then they neglect thoſe duties.

And thus, if Sureties are bound thus to give ſuch Reproof and Chriſtian Admonition to thoſe Parents and Children for whom they have undertaken to the Church, it is but a very neceſſary Duty that they are thus bound to, and which all Chriſtians are oblig'd to perform towards one another, as there is occaſion. Thoſe very Duties which we are oblig'd in General to perform towards one another, we are but more Particularly oblig'd to perform them towards thoſe Children for whom we become Sureties.

And

And therefore, They who ſhun the Charitable work of becoming Sureties for Children, becauſe they are thereby oblig'd to Adviſe, Counſel, Exhort, and Reprove them as they find occaſion; they may e'en as well refuſe to become Chriſtians, becauſe by their very Chriſtianity they are oblig'd (if there be a like occaſion) to Adviſe, Counſel, Exhort, or Reprove all their Fellow-Chriſtians.

And further, If ſome wou'd have all Sureties at *Baptiſm* to be laid aſide, Becauſe there are but few ſuch Sureties that Conſcientiouſly perform what they undertake; might not the ſame reaſon perſwade others to lay *Baptiſm* it ſelf aſide, *viz.* Becauſe there are but few who are Baptized that Conſcientiouſly perform their *Baptiſmal* Engagements?

For thus, Here comes a bold Man, and makes a Noiſe, and quarrels with the Church, for Requiring that Children ſhall have Sureties to undertake for their Inſtruction and Education in the Chriſtian Religion; and all the Reaſon that he can give againſt the uſe of ſuch Sureties, is, becauſe ſo few of them do as they ſay, or perform what they promiſe. And, Dear Sir, May not another bold Fellow be thus Encouraged to quarrel with the Church, for putting it upon all Perſons to *Renounce the Devil, the World and the Fleſh* at their *Baptiſm*, *viz.* Becauſe but few who are Baptized do ſo Renounce theſe Spiritual Enemies in their Lives and Practices, as by their *Baptiſmal-Engagements* they are oblig'd to do. Sure-

Surely, if the general neglect of Sureties, as to the Obligations laid upon them, be a good Reason why there ſhould be no Sureties at all; then the like general neglect of Baptized Perſons, as to the Obligations laid upon them too, may be thought a good Reaſon why there ſhould be none Baptized at all.

But, Sir, When People have nothing to ſay againſt the uſe of Sureties, but that the Duties which they take upon themſelves are ſeldom regarded; Theſe very People may ſoon help to remove the Objection, Namely, by their undertaking for, and performing theſe Duties towards Children; whereby the uſefulneſs and advantage of having ſuch Sureties would be ſeen and felt, and the good and Charitable meaning of the Church would be underſtood and applauded where ſhe requires, that there ſhall be for every *Male-Child* to be Baptized, two God-Fathers and one God-Mother, and for every *Female*, one God-Father and two God-mothers.

Upon the whole matter, Let us take care that our Children as well as our ſelves be admitted into the *New Covenant* by *Baptiſm*; For 'tis the one and onely *Covenant* by which both we and our Children are to be ſaved; and let us remember how heavily God complain'd by his Prophet of ſome, who took away his Glory for ever from little Children, *Micah* 2. 9.

'Tis true, When our New-born *Infants* die Unbaptized before we can poſſibly bring them to

to that Holy Sacrament, we may reaſonably hope that in ſuch a Caſe the want of Baptiſm will neither be required of them nor us.

But when we refuſe, or neglect to have them Baptiz'd, when we neither want time nor opportunity ſo to do; then "what ever happens to the "Innocents (ſays the Seraphick Biſhop *Taylor*) "we may well fear leſt God ſhould require their "Souls at our hands. We know indeed (ſays he) "that God is good, infinitely good, but we know "that it is not at all good to tempt his Goodneſs; "and yet he tempts God's Goodneſs, who ex-"pects to meet his Children in Heaven, when "himſelf ſhuts the Door (which is *Baptiſm*) a-"gainſt them; which, for ought he knows, is the only Door that ſtands open.

And now, Sir, As you put it upon me to begin theſe Letters with a very Solemn Proteſtation, ſo I will here take leave to Conclude them with one too, and therefore in the Apoſtle's words 2 *Cor.* 1.23. *I call God for a Record upon my Soul*, that I would not for all the World have any *Child* of mine die unbaptized through my fault or negligence: Dear Sir, *I ſay the Truth in Chriſt, I lye not*, as the ſame Apoſtle proteſts again. And you may aſſure your ſelf that I ſpeak the Truth likewiſe, when I tell you that I am,

SIR,

July 29. 1698.

Your very ſincere and faithful Servant,

T. H.

FINIS.